THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositorytimes0010jame

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
T582 47,375

VOLUME THE TENTH.

October 1898 – September 1899.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON	SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
MANCHESTER	JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK	CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.
TORONTO	FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY.

CONTENTS OF VOL. X.

CONTRIBUTORS.

PAGE

Mr. F. P. Badham, M.A. 287
Rev. Frank Ballard, M.A., B.Sc. . . 248
Professor J. S. Banks 14, 166
Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D. . . . 43
Rev. W. E. Beet, B.A. 230
Professor Friedrich Blass, Ph.D., Th.D., LL.D. 88, 185, 286
Hon. and Rev. W. E. Bowen, M.A. . . 29
Rev. G. H. Box, M.A. 425
Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith, M.A. . . . 383
Rev. G. G. Brown, M.A. 235
Mr. James Brown 91
Canon A. H. Browne, D.D. . . . 185
Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D. . . . 127
Miss Ada Bryson, M.A. . . . 294, 487
Rev. J. H. Burn, B.D. 188
Rev. N. Macleod Caie, B.D. . . . 90
Rev. W. L. Carter, M.A. 379
Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D. 94, 141, 238, 284, 330, 336, 375, 380, 399, 422, 429, 444, 476, 520
Lic. Carl Clemen, Ph.D. 344
Rev. W. Clifford, M.A. 188
Mr. Stanley A. Cook, M.A. . . 279, 525
Professor Gustaf Dalman, Ph.D. . . . 180
Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D. 65, 444
Professor T. Witton Davies, B.A., Ph.D. . 67
Professor S. R. Driver, D.D. . . . 15
Rev. D. Eaton, M.A. . . . 364, 438, 539
Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D. . . 199, 390
Professor G. G. Findlay, B.A. . . . 365
Canon F. H. Fisher, D.D. 379
Rev. D. R. Fotheringham, M.A. . . 45
Rev. A. E. Garvie, B.D. 301, 356, 419, 453, 509
Professor Lucien Gautier, Ph.D. . . 328, 429
Rev. R. Glaister, B.D. 360
Mr. G. Buchanan Gray, M.A. . . . 232
Rev. J. A. F. Gregg, M.A. 281
Rev. A. Grieve, M.A., Ph.D. . . . 523

PAGE

Professor H. M. Gwatkin, D.D. . . . 104
Mr. N. Herz, M.A. 47
Professor Fritz Hommel, Ph.D., . . 42, 48, 92, 144, 210, 278, 283, 329, 367, 423, 459, 520, 566
Mr. A. Taylor Innes 522
Professor P. Jensen, Ph.D. . 304, 405, 423, 501, 527, 567
Rev. C. H. W. Johns, M.A. . 423, 523, 526
Rev. W. Johnston, B.D. 152
Rev. H. A. A. Kennedy, M.A., D.Sc. . 22, 187
Professor Ed. König, Ph.D., D.D. 16, 124, 189, 227, 255, 333, 376, 512, 564
Rev. Marshall B. Lang, B.D. . . . 46
Rev. A. S. Langley, M.A. 332
Rev. R. A. Lendrum, M.A. . . . 452
Rev. J. P. Lilley, B.D. 88
Rev. Duff MacDonald, B.D. . . . 188
Rev. H. R. Macintosh, M.A., Ph.D. . . 116
Professor D. S. Margoliouth, M.A. . 528, 567
Rev. G. Margoliouth, M.A. . . . 91
Principal J. T. Marshall, M.A. . . . 320
Rev. G. Currie Martin, B.D. . . . 281
Mr. J. H. Martin 547
Dr. E. W. G. Masterman, F.R.C.S. . . 315
Mrs. Robertson Matheson 475
Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A. . . 37, 84, 128, 181, 223, 268
Rev. James Moffatt, B.D. 445
Rev. W. Montgomery. 284
Rev. Dunlop Moore, D.D. 426
Rev. J. H. Morrison, M.A. 283
Rev. J. H. Moulton, M.A. 14
Rev. W. Muir, B.D., B.L. 466
Rev. Charles Neil, M.A. 122
Professor Eb. Nestle, Ph.D., D.D. 43, 47, 48, 91, 93, 143, 185, 188, 218, 237, 276, 282, 284, 422, 475, 523, 525, 527
Rev. E. Petavel, D.D. 378

AUG 13 1959 UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PAGE

Rev. George Philip, M.A., D.D. . . . 92
Rev. A. Plummer, M.A., D.D. . . . 235
Rev. A. Poynder, M.A. 287
Principal R. Rainy, D.D. 254
Professor W. M. Ramsay, LL.D., D.C.L. 9, 54, 95, 107, 157, 208, 232, 336, 384, 527
Professor Alexander Roberts, D.D. . . 15
Principal A. Robertson, D.D. . . . 394
Professor W. Sanday, D.D., LL.D. . . 432
Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D. . 24, 75, 115, 143, 171, 201, 231, 267, 303, 332, 352, 384, 418, 430, 470, 510, 551
Dr. S. Schechter, M.A. 568
Rev. J. A. Selbie, M.A. . . 26, 60, 69, 117, 164, 221, 278, 325, 358, 378, 395, 451, 475, 476, 495, 559

PAGE

Mr. G. A. Simcox, M.A. 430
Rev. R. M. Spence, M.A., D.D. . 91, 235, 444
Rev. J. H. Srawley, M.A. 536
Lic. C. Steuernagel, Ph.D. 476
Principal A. Stewart, D.D. 393
Rev. T. C. Sturrock, B.D. 499
Professor H. B. Swete, D.D., Litt.D. . 127, 511
Professor J. G. Tasker . 27, 219, 449, 495
Rev. John Taylor, M.A., D. Litt. . 417, 557
Rev. A. Thom, M.A. 234
Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, M.A. . . 384
Rev. G. E. Troup, M.A. 37
Rev. Adam Welch 60
Rev. James Wells, D.D. . . 62, 257, 366, 473, 492, 554
Prebendary B. Whitefoord, B.D. . . . 235

SUBJECTS.

PAGE

Abel-mizraim 553
Abraham and Moses, Date 210, 278
Accadians 71
Acts 287
,, Two Editions . . 95, 395
Ahikar 276
Alexander, Name . . . 527
Amalek 400
Anthropology and Christianity . 485
Apostolic Succession 342
Aramaisms in New Testament . 321
Archæological Commentary on Genesis . . 75, 171, 418, 551
Archæology, Recent Biblical 201, 267, 470, 510
Armenia 471
Astruc's Theory 91
Atonement 292
Baasha 375
Babylon, Capture by Cyrus . 119
Balaam, Critical Difficulties . 399
Baptism 51
Barnabas 232
Barsabbas 527
'Beast' of the Apocalypse . . 69
Beersheba, Wells . . 328, 429
'Beholding' 473
Benôni, Bin-yamin . . . 92
Bible, Large Type Sentences . 14
,, Hospitality . . . 62
,, Uniqueness . . . 536
Bishop 523
Butler, Pharaoh's . . . 379
Caiaphas 185
Cain 352
Catenæ 218, 281
Chedorlaomer . . 267, 470, 523
Christ, Ascension . . . 532
,, Birth at Bethlehem . 97
,, Crucifixion . . 315, 383
,, Divine and Human Natures 92
,, Incarnation . . 199, 361
,, Language . . 321, 438
,, Miraculous . . . 531
,, Priesthood . . . 290

PAGE

Christ, Sympathy in Life's Commonplace . . . 360
,, Temptation . . 301, 356, 419, 453, 509
,, Trial . . . 434, 522
,, Virgin-Birth . . . 532
Chronology, Old Testament . 210
,, New ,, . 4
Coinage, New Testament . . 45
Comfort 48
Commentary, Great Text . 19, 73, 111, 161, 204, 260, 317, 354, 402, 456, 517, 561
Confession in Pagan Ritual 55, 158
Contemplation . . . 492, 554
Courage 448
Creation 495
,, Babylonian . . . 536
Criticism, Old Testament . 221, 238, 242, 426, 476
,, New ,, . . 487
Crown of Life . . 230, 283, 332
Crucifixion, Date . . 315, 383
Cuneiform Inscriptions . . 115
Curse 50
Cyrus 119
Dale, R. W. 152
Death, Fear of 392
Deborah 568
Deluge Tablet . . 201, 278, 332
Demonology 326
Deuteronomy, Unity . 16, 124, 227
Dikdûkê ha-te'amîm, § 70 . . 333
Ea 144
Ecclesiasticus, Hebrew 67, 433, 481, 512, 528, 564, 567
Eliezer 567
Elohim 219, 221
Embalming 552
Enrolment, Augustus' . 98, 231
Ethnarch 222
Exegetical Studies . 366, 473, 492
Exposition, Notes of Recent 1, 49, 97, 145, 193, 241, 289, 337, 385, 433, 481

PAGE

Expiation, Pagan . . . 157
Ezra 150
Faith 343
Father in Heaven . . . 324
Family in Jewish Law . . 167
Foreign Theology . 24, 65, 115, 164, 218, 264, 320, 364, 393, 449, 495
Foreigners in Jewish Law . . 167
Genesis, Archæological Commentary . . 75, 171, 418, 551
Gideon 445
Gloria in Excelsis . . . 291
Goat in Pagan Sacrifice . . 56
God, Fatherhood . 102, 188, 386
,, Manifestation . . . 208
,, Names . 208, 221, 324, 427
,, Power 208
Gospel for every Age . . . 529
Gospels, Original Language 321, 438
Greek of Early Church and Pagan Ritual . . 9, 54, 107, 157, 208
Guild of Bible Study 15, 65, 106, 157
Hebrews, Epistle . 290, 422, 430
Historical Study, Methods 340, 432
Hittite Inscriptions . 115, 304, 367, 384, 405, 423, 459, 501, 527, 559, 567
Homer, Influence on Early Church 146
Horn 388
Hosea, Our Lord's Use of . . 281
Hospitality 257
Hosts, Lord of 388
Husks 482
Humility 499
Hyksos Period 551
Hymn, Latin 88
Hymns, Early 291
Ignatius, 'Ad Romanos' . . 379
Immortality . . . 1, 390
,, Conditional . 248, 378
Incarnation and the Inner Life . 199
Inspiration of the Church . . 29
Israel, Social Laws . . . 166
Jehovah . . . 144, 221, 444

	PAGE
Judaism after the Exile	148
Jülicher on Christ's Parables	539
Kadytis	203
Khammurabi	267
Kingdom of Heaven	322
Kiriath-arba	287
Lamentations	26
Land in Jewish Law	168
Laws (Social) of Israel	166
Lazarus	398
Life after Death	390
,, Eternal	323
,, Protection in Jewish Law	166
Logos	199
Lord's Supper	90, 235, 246, 254, 257, 384, 436
Luke, Attitude to Roman World	100
Machnadebai	232
Magic	326
Malachi, Date	255
Malchus' Ear	188
Man, Centre of Theology	101
Mani	423, 475, 526, 566
Mansions	303
Metheg-ammah	568
Miracles	52, 139
Moon-Worship	329, 375, 376, 387
Moses, Date	210
Muhammedanism	393
Music, Temple	497
Nebo	232
Nebuchadrezzar's Siege of Tyre	378, 430, 475, 520
Nehemiah	149
Nero	69
New Testament Text	27, 95, 187, 294, 487
Oaths, Pagan	109
Old Latin Versions	187
Old Testament Text	118
Origen's Commentary on Ephesians	282
Oxyrhynchus Papyri	222
Pagan Ritual	9, 54
Palestinian-Syriac Version	47, 91
Parables, Christ's	539
Paraclete	169
Passover and Lord's Supper	436
Patriarchs, Antediluvian	352
Paul, Conversion	194
,, Self-Assertion	445
,, Thorn in the Flesh	110, 481
,, Visits to Damascus	338
Pereunt et Imputantur	185
Pharaoh of Exodus	303
Pharaoh's Butler	379
Pharisees, Name	558
Philippians, Historical Background of Epistle	22
Point and Illustration	398, 472
Poor in Jewish Law	168
Prayer	398
,, for the Dead	49, 143, 235, 236, 237
Presbyter	523
Prophecy in Early Church	346
Propitiation, Pagan	157
Psalter, Date	557
Punishment in Paganism	110
Purity ,, ,,	107
Quadrans	185, 232, 286, 336
Quirinius	99
Reformation, Gospel of	529, 532
Requests and Replies	14, 60, 127, 254, 303, 444, 511
Rest	48
Resurrection, First	289
Ritual	398
Rothe, Richard	449
Rufus	527
Sa	329, 375, 376, 525
Sacramental Hospitality	257
Sacrifice, Eucharistic	197
Salvation	472
Sargon	24
Self-Assertion, Reponsibility of	445
Sennacherib	24
Sermonettes on the Golden Texts	37, 84, 128, 181, 223, 268
Seth	352
Sethos	203
Sham'al	399
Sheshbazzar	148
Shinar	470
Sin	56, 385
,, (god)	387
Sisera	203
Slavery in Israel	167
Sleep	398
Son of Man	324, 438
Soul	2
Substitution	531
Sumerians	71
Swete, Professor H. B.	537
Te Deum	291
Temperance	466
Throng and the Touch	122
Tongues, Speaking with	345
Trinity, Literature	511
Tyre, Siege	378, 430, 475, 520
Union with Christ	343
Unrest of the Age	104
Usu	204
Woman's Rights	417
World	323
Yahweh in Early Babylonia	42
,, Etymology	48
Zerubbabel	148, 243

BOOKS.

	PAGE
Abbott, St. Thomas of Canterbury	138
Addis, Documents of the Hexateuch	135
Adeney, Women of the New Testament	178
Aitken, Abiding Law	374
Alexander, Christianity of St. Paul	464
Alfred the Great	543
Askwith, Galatians	464
Authority and Archæology	535
Ball, Light from the East	470
Ball, Testimonials to Christ	314
Bennett, Joshua (Polychrome Bible)	463
Benzinger, Books of Kings	497
Bernard, Via Domini	175
Bertholet, Hebrew Notions of the State after Death	496
Bible, Modern Reader's	373, 545
,, Polychrome	463
,, Revised, with References	79
,, Self-Pronouncing	217
Black, R. L. Stevenson	82
Blackwood, Conference Memories	217
Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek	79
Bliss, Excavations at Jerusalem	178
Bonwetsch and Achelis, Hippolytus	264
Books of the Heart	177
Briggs, Study of Holy Scripture	310
Bright, Primitive Church Life	216
Brooke, Gospel of Joy	133
Brown, Primitive Constellations of the Greeks, Phœnicians, and Babylonians	375
Bruce, Epistle to the Hebrews	290, 310
Bryant, Teaching of Jesus on Life and Conduct	83
Burkitt, Hymn of Bardaisan	544
Butler, Lausiac History of Palladius	36
,, University Sermons	414
,, Wesley and Whitefield in Scotland	276
Budde, Lamentations	26
Burn, Helps to Godly Living	275
,, Introduction to the Creeds	373
Caird, University Addresses	215
,, ,, Sermons	214
Carter, Spirit of Watchfulness	372
Carus-Wilson, Unseal the Book	466
Chantre, Mission en Cappadoce	115
Cheyne, Jewish Religious Life after the Exile	145, 148
Church Hymnary	79
Clapperton, Methods of Soul Culture	83
,, Pitfalls in Bible English	506
,, Ten to One	506
Clarke, Christian Theology	83
Clifford, Social Worship	544
,, Typical Christian Leaders	135
Clow, In the Day of the Cross	137
Collins and Cowley, Gesenius-Kautzsch Hebrew Grammar	35
Cone, Paul: Man, Missionary, Teacher	194, 213
Cook, Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions	180
Corbet, Letters from a Mystic	386, 416
Cornill, History of People of Israel	82
Creighton, Lessons from the Cross	81
Crump, Buried Sphinx	174
Curtin, Creation-Myths of Primitive America	315

PAGE

Dale, Life of R. W. Dale . . 180
,, Essays and Addresses . 464
Dalman, Die Worte Jesu . 320, 438
Davidson, Autobiography . . 463
,, Christian Ethics . 413
Davies, Magic, Divination, and Demonology . . 174
,, Spiritual Apprehension . 134
Dawson, Comrades . . . 465
Dearden, Modern Romanism Explained 507
Dennis, Christian Missions . 508
Dictionary of the Bible 96, 117, 151, 241, 337, 385, 435
Dryander, First Epistle of St. John 314
Duhm, Die Psalmen . . . 557
Ecclesiasticus, Hebrew . . 67
Elmslie, Among the Wild Ngoni 415
Evans, Free Church History . 462
Eversley Shakespeare . 312, 373, 414, 465, 546
Fairbairn, Catholicism, Roman and Anglican . . . 274
Farrar, Great Books . . . 133
Field, Otium Norvicense . . 483
Forrest, Christ of History and of Experience . . . 273
Fotheringham, Mind and Art of Robert Browning . . . 81
Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar . 265
Gibson, From Fact to Faith . 81
,, Job 313
Gilbert, Student's Life of Paul . 545
Girdlestone, Student's Deuteronomy 506
Golding-Bird, Christ Foreshown 178
Gore, Epistle to Romans . . 415
Goulburn, Lord's Prayer . . 135
Green, Christian Creed and Creeds of Christendom . . 274
Greenwell, Colloquia Crucis . 372
Griffith-Jones, Ascent through Christ 412
Guthrie, Knox's History of the Reformation 131
Haeckel, Last Link 194
Harford-Battersby, Pilkington of Uganda 312
Harnack, History of Dogma, vol. v. 214; vol. vi. 416
,, Thoughts on Protestantism . . . 343
Harris, Homeric Centones . 146
Harrison, Clovelly Sermons . 313
Hawkins, Horae Synopticae . 311
Henson, Apostolic Christianity . 214
Herzog, Real Encyclopädie . 219
Hodgson, Theologia Pectoris 101, 132
Holzinger, Genesis . . . 65
Hort, Cambridge Sermons 51, 80
,, First Epistle of St. Peter . 80
Horton, Commandments of Jesus 175
How, Life of Bishop Walsham How 139
Hutton, Religious and Scientific Thought 372
,, Soul Here and Hereafter 134
Ingram, Banners of Christian Faith 372
Innes, Trial of Jesus Christ . 434, 463, 522

PAGE

Jastrow, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria 216
Jerdan, For the Lord's Table . 136
Kautzsch, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 120, 265, 496
,, Literature of Old Testament . . . 214
Kennedy, Daniel . . . 133
Kilpatrick, Christian Character . 506
Knox Little, Perfect Life . . 176
Köberle, Temple Musicians . 497
König, Exiles' Book of Consolation: Is. 40–66 . . . 451
Kuyper, Encyclopædia of Sacred Theology 273
Langhorne, Aids to Belief . . 137
Lehmann, Altorientalische Chronologie 24
Leonard, Sacred Songs of the World 508
Lepine, Ministers of Jesus Christ 176
Lietzmann, Catenae . . . 218
Linklater, True Limits of Ritual 413
Lomax, History of the Jews . 33
Loofs, Creation Narrative . . 495
Lovett, London Missionary Society 464
Lushington, Sermons to Young Boys 81
MacCoun, Holy Land in Geography and History . . 178
Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs 36
Mackintosh, From Comte to Benjamin Kidd . . . 545
MacMurchy, Philemon . . 177
Macpherson, Adam Smith . . 313
,, Christian Dogmatics 37
Margoliouth, Syriac Dictionary . 462
Marsden, Gem of Orthodoxy . 416
Martyn, For Christ and the Truth 179
Matthews, Moral Education . 179
Milligan, Hebrews . . . 273
Montefiore, Bible for Home Reading 507
Morgan, Calls of God . . 372
,, Wherein? . . . 81
Morrison, Oldest Trade in the World 136
Mortimer, Catholic Faith and Practice 215
Moss, Range of Christian Experience 134
Moulton, Visions of Sin . . 217
Müller, Origins of Christian Life 394
,, Prophets in their Original Form 325
Murison, Robert the Bruce . 546
Nash, Ethics and Revelation . 546
New Testament, Twentieth Century 179
Nicol, Recent Archæology and the Bible 411
Oettli, Ideal und Leben . . 166
Orr, Christianity, Early Progress 274
Overton, Law's 'Serious Call' . 134
Palmer, Gospel Problems . . 462
Parker, Studies in Texts . . 414
Parsons, Life for Africa . . 213
Paterson, Greater Life and Work of Christ 50

PAGE

Pautz, Muhammed's Doctrine of Revelation 393
Pearse, God of our Pleasures . 81
Peile, Exodus 78
,, Readings from Pentateuch 272
Perowne, Doctrine of Lord's Supper 314
Philip, Father's Hand . . 275
Piepenbring, History of People of Israel 166
Pike, Divine Drama . . . 176
Plaistowe, Tutorial Latin Dictionary 132
Plummer, St. Luke . . 78, 397
Pollard, Land of Monuments . 35
Prášek, Ancient Oriental History 203
Pullan, Early Christian Doctrine 374
Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 97
Rankin, Church Ideas in Scripture and Scotland . . . 311
Ratzel, History of Mankind . 312
Reichel, Sermons . . . 507
Resker, Our Lord's Illustrations 463
Reynolds, Life and Letters . 175
Roberts, Our Prayer Book . . 314
Robertson, Christian Minister . 415
,, Poetry and Religion of the Psalms 132, 242
Rothe, Speculative System . 364
Rowntree and Sherwell, Temperance Problem and Social Reform 466
Salmond, Critical Review . . 132
Sallmon, Culture of Christian Manhood 415
Sanday, Conception of Priesthood 195
Saunders, Quest of Faith . . 411
Schürer, History of Jewish People 164
Selby, Unheeding God . . 312
Simon, Reconciliation by Incarnation 213
Smellie, Hour of Silence . . 507
Smith, Books of Samuel . . 358
,, Drummond's Biography . 198
Spurgeon, Autobiography . 34, 547
,, Good Start . . 178
St. Clair, Creation Records . 136
Stevens, Theology of New Testament 412
Stewart, Judges . . . 508
,, Origins of Scottish Presbytery . . . 374
Storrow, Our Indian Sisters . 83
Stout, Psychology . . . 216
Strack, Introduction to Old Testament 67
Strange, Revelation of St. John . 414
Streane, Age of Maccabees . 133
Stuart, Tracings from Gospel of St. John 218
Studia Sinaitica 544
Sullivan, Morality as a Religion 215
Swete, St. Mark's Gospel . . 137
Taylor, Oxyrynchus Logia . . 464
Thompson, Thoughts on the Word 373
Thudichum, Hebrews . . 451
Tiele, Science of Religion . . 311
Tiffany, Prayer-Book and Christian Life 374

	PAGE
Toy, Ezekiel (Polychrome Bible)	463
Treanor, Cry from the Sea	136
Tyler, Ecclesiastes	465
Walker, Jesus Christ and His Surroundings	133
Wallace, Jerusalem the Holy	212
Ward, Naturalism and Agnosticism	505
Waterman, Post-Apostolic Age	272
Weir, Hebrew Text of Old Testament	466
Welch, Authorship of Hebrews	82
Welldon, Hope of Immortality	1
Welsh, People and the Priest	78
Wernle, Paul the Missionary	365
Whyte, Bible Characters	415
,, Sir Thomas Browne	36
Williams, Belief in Life	135
Wilson, Gospel of the Atonement	372
,, Maxims of Piety	176
Winterbotham, Kingdom of Heaven	289, 313
Wirgman, Authority of Bishops in Catholic Church	414
Workman, Church of the West in Middle Ages	79

HEBREW WORDS.

	PAGE
אֱלֹהִים	219
אַרְנָז	521
אֵת	192
בְּצַר	94
גְּאוֹן	444
דֶּרֶךְ	512
חֲרוּבִים	482
יה	444
יהוה	42, 48, 144, 189
לדויד	558
לַפִּיד	552
מְכֹרָה	552
מִשֶּׁה	212
נֶשֶׁק	279, 330
עוֹלָם	323, 422
פִּלֶגֶשׁ	552
צו	329, 375, 376, 525
שִׁלְטִים	43, 188
תּוֹעָפוֹת	94, 401

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE
ἀγαθός	107
ἁγνός,	108
αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος	323
ἁμαρτία	57
ἀποκαλύπτω	492
αὐλή	186
βάσανοι	110
βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	322
βεβαίωσις	23
διάδημα	230, 283
διάταγμα, διατάσσομαι	160
δύναμις	208
ἐξεμπλάριον	159
ἐξομολογέομαι	158
ἐπιλαμβάνομαι	284
ἐπιφαίνω	493
ἐπιφάνεια, ἐπιφανής	208
ἐποπτής	473
εὐλογέω	54
εὐσεβής	107
εὐχαριστέω	54
εὐχαριστία	282
εὐχή	13
ζωὴ αἰώνιος	323
θεάομαι	474
θεωρέω	474
ἱλασμός, ἱλαστήριον	158
ἵνα	339
καλός	107, 493
κατοπτρίζομαι	473
κοδράντης	186, 232, 286, 336
κοινόω, κοινός	541
κόσμος	323
κύριος	209
λαμπάς	552
λειτουργέω	14
λύτρον	158
Μακκαβαῖος	121
μάχαιρα	552
μονή	303
ὁμολογέω	158
ὅσιος	208
παλλακίς	552
παράκλητος	169
πάσχω	57
πίστις	237
πραιτώριον	23, 186
πρεσβύτερος	523
στέφανος	230, 283, 332
σωτηρία	23
σωτήριον	158
ὑστερέω	58
φανερόω	493
φυλακτήριον	13

TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gen. i. 1	19
i. 26, 27	72
ii.	91
iii. 15	111
iii. 16	425, 476
iv. 1	376
iv. 7	161, 425, 476
iv. 9	205
v. 24	260
v. 29	48
xii. 1–3	317
xiii. 10–12	354
xviii 1–8	62
xxii. 1, 2	402
xxv. 34	456
xxviii. 16, 17	517
xxxii. 24, 25	561
xxxv. 18	92
xxxvii. 5, 17, 28	75
xxxvii. 36	76
Gen. xxxviii. 3, 4, 12, 14, 18, 21	76
xxxix. 7	76
xxxix. 14, 20	77
xl. 1, 2, 8, 11, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20	171
xl. 11	379
xli. 1, 2, 6, 8, 14, 38, 41, 42	172
xli. 43, 45, 46, 50, 54	173
xli. 56, 57	174
xlii. 11, 15, 23, 26, 27, 30	418
xliii. 11, 23, 27, 28, 32, 34	418
xliv. 2, 4, 5, 15	418
xlv. 8	418
xlv. 10, 11, 19	419
xlvi. 16, 17, 34	551
Gen. xlvii. 4, 6, 11, 14, 15, 20–26	551
xlviii. 22	552
xlix. 5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 20, 22, 24	552
l. 2, 3	552
l. 4, 7, 10, 11, 22	553
Ex. xxxiv. 29	388
Num. xxii. 5	401
xxiii. 22	94, 401
xxiv. 6	401
xxiv. 8	94
xxiv. 20, 23, 24	399
Deut. xxxiii. 19	238
Judg. i. 10	287
v. 16	552
vii. 17	445
ix. 37	286
1 Sam. i. 6	284
ii. 1	388
1 Sam. vi. 8, 11, 15	521
xii. 3	143
xv. 7	239
xvi. 12	521
xvii. 1, 6, 52	521
xvii. 54	522
xxvii. 8	239
xxx. 30	522
xxxi. 10	522
2 Sam. viii. 7	44
xii. 26–31	285
1 Kings x. 11	239
x. 25	279, 330
2 Kings ii. 20	47
vi. 25	482
xi. 10	44
xvi. 2, 20	60
xvii. 29	429
xviii. 1, 2	60
xviii. 27	482

	PAGE
2 Kings xviii. 34	429
xxiii. 13	285
1 Chron. xxix. 2	240
2 Chron. xiv. 11	37
xxiii. 9	44
xxviii. 15	285
xxx. 8	84
xxxiv. 12	39
xxxv. 25	26
Ezra x. 40	232
Neh. i. 3	243
iii. 19	279, 330
Job iii. 4, 5	380
v. 3	381
v. 5	283, 335
vii. 1, 15, 16, 17, 18	381
xi. 17	381
xiii. 12, 15	382
xix. 25–27	47, 91
xx. 7, 23	382
xxii. 24, 25	94
xxvi. 5	382
xxviii. 18	382
xxx. 18	382
xli. 19	330
Ps. xvii. 4	558
xxiii.	46
xxx. 9	390
xl. 6	242
xlv. 2	141
xlvi. 1	85
lxxxi. 8	286
xcv. 4	94
cxix. 2	128
cxlix. 9	234
Prov. i. 10	87
iii. 6	38
Eccles. iii. 11	422
Isa. i. 19, 20	482
v. 1–7	325
vi. 8	40
xi. 9	41
xii. 2	444
xxvi. 4	444
xxxiii. 17	14
xl. 8	128
liii.	145, 266
lvii. 1	146
lxv. 1, 2	150
lxv. 11	423
Jer. xii. 5	444
xiii. 23	45
xxix. 13	129
xlviii. 25	388
Jer. xlix. 19	444
l. 44	444
li. 11	44
Ezek. viii. 3, 5	142
ix. 2	286
xxxviii. 2, 3	142
xxxviii. 12	286
xxxix. 1	142
Dan. vii. 13	324, 439
Hos. v. 11	329, 375, 376
vi. 6	281
ix. 10	281
Amos viii. 14	512
Hab. iii. 4	286
Hag. vi. 9–12	149
Zech. vii. 2	234
xi. 2	286
Mal. iv. 6	50
Sir 39^{17}	513
$39^{20\text{-}30}$	512
40^{9}	513
40^{16}	513
40^{26}	514
41^{9}	513
41^{12}	514
42^{11}	515
42^{14}	564
43^{2}	564
$43^{4\text{-}8}$	515, 568
$43^{6\text{-}13\text{-}17}$	565
$43^{9\text{-}20\text{-}24}$	516
43^{22}	566
$45^{7\text{-}25}$	513
46^{19}	513
46^{20}	516
Matt. i. 45	91
iv. 24	110
ix. 35	127
xi. 28	483
xv. 10, 15–20	540
xvii. 27	45
xviii. 20	43
xviii. 28	45
xix. 24	338
xx. 1–16	541
xx. 28	158
xxi. 15, 16	525
xxv. 31–46	127
xxvi. 26–29	246
Mark ii. 1–4	100
vi. 20	483
vii. 14–23	540
x. 30	323
x. 42	158
Mark xii. 42	185, 232, 286, 336
xiii. 31	475
xiv. 22–25	246
xv. 16	185
xvi. 17	346
Luke i. 64	54
ii. 1 ff.	97
ii. 11	130
ii. 12, 49	484
iii. 32	91
v. 19	100
ix. 19–22	338
xiii. 2–4	55
xiii. 4	57
xv. 22	93
xvi. 25	48
xvii. 23, 28	110
xviii. 13	157
xviii. 45	122
xxii. 17–20	247
xxiii. 53	147
xxiv. 53	54
John i. 1	50
i. 4	181
i. 14	474, 492
i. 36	181
ii. 11	182
iii. 16	183
iv. 14	184
iv. 42	224
iv. 53	223
vi. 35	225
vii. 37	226
viii. 3–11	193
viii. 36	268
ix. 2	57
ix. 25	269
x. 11	270
x. 27	271
xiii. 29	315
xiv. 2	303
xiv. 16, 26	169
xv. 26	169
xvi. 7	169
xvi. 13	26
xvii. 18–26	339
xvii. 24	474, 492
xviii. 28	315
xix. 14, 31	315
Acts ii. 4–11	344
iv. 36	233
xv. 28	143
xv. 32–40	28
Acts xv. 34	88
xviii.	88
xviii. 4–7	28
xix. 18	158
xxvii. 41	146
Rom. xii. 11	284
1 Cor. iv. 4	444
v. 5	59
xi. 23–25	246
xi. 29, 30	56
xii.–xiv.	346
xiv. 18	346
2 Cor. iii. 18	473, 492, 554, 555
xi. 32	222
xii. 7	110, 481
Gal. i. 15–17	338
Eph. iv. 8	533
v. 4	282
v. 14	534
Phil. iii. 17	445
iv. 9	445
1 Tim. iii. 16	493
2 Tim. iv.	430
Tit. ii. 11	493
iii. 4	493
Heb. i. 6	7
ii. 10, 14, 15	291
ii. 16	284, 360
ii. 17	158
iv. 1	58
ix. 16, 27	290
x. 6	242
x. 14	291
xiii.	430
Jas. v. 16	158
1 Pet. i. 2	188
i. 21	237
ii. 7	234
ii. 12	473, 492
iii. 2	473
iii. 6	282
iii. 18, 20	60
v. 5	499
2 Pet. i. 16, 18	473, 492
1 John i. 9	86
ii. 1	169
iv. 2	199
Rev. i. 9	289
ii. 10	230, 283, 332
xii. 1, 3	147
xiii. 3	70
xvii. 10	70

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Bishop Welldon—for so it seems we must call him now—has published, through Messrs. Seeley, a new volume, to which he has given the title of *The Hope of Immortality*. It is not a hopeful title. Surely immortality is more than a hope now. Surely it is a positive possession, since Jesus died and rose again. But there is immortality in Christ, and immortality out of Christ. It is not denied that they that sleep in Jesus shall God bring with Him. It is denied that any others shall awake to an everlasting day beyond the grave.

So Bishop Welldon writes his book to prove that. And even to the reader who has settled that question long ago, it is an interesting book. For Mr. Welldon has the knack of touching reality in all he writes. This matter of immortality may be outside the range of practical interest, but death is within. And when Mr. Welldon opens his first chapter in this way: 'In the experience of every man, there is no such moment as when he looks for the first time on the face of death. He can never forget that moment, nor ever live as though it had not been. He may have spent many years in the world, and the years may have been rich in interest and happiness, but at last he stands face to face with the reality which solemnizes and sanctifies all things. From that time, even if he be frivolous and careless, he never wholly loses the sense of the awful vision. He knows that for him—for all his hopes, desires, ambitions, enterprises, victories—there is but one end. He is another man.' When Mr. Welldon opens his first chapter in that way, he has found his audience.

And that moment we have entered upon his proofs of immortality. For the things which death suggests, as soon as the first strong agony of bereavement begins to spend itself, are these: There is first *the thought of peacefulness*. The life may have been embittered by circumstances, harassed with care, stained with sin, tortured with pain; it may have been distressed, misunderstood, scorned, reprobated, condemned—yet its end is peace. The feeling comes to us that the wicked in death do cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. Next there is *the thought of beauty*. The beauty of death, says Bishop Welldon, is as exquisite as it is transient. Whereupon inevitably he quotes the lines from Byron's *Giaour*—

> He who hath bent him o'er the dead
> Ere the first day of death is fled.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> (Before decay's effacing fingers
> Have swept the lines where beauty lingers)
> And marked the mild angelic air,
> The rapture of repose that's there,

The fixed yet tender traits that streak
The languor of the placid cheek.
. . . . . .
Some moments, ay, one treacherous hour,
He still might doubt the tyrant's power;
So fair, so calm, so softly sealed
The first, last look by death revealed.

And then there is *the thought of expectancy*. 'I do not know how to describe it,' he says, 'but it is there. The spectacle of death is somehow not complete in itself. There is something prophetic in the face of the dead.'

It is 'the face of the dead' that carries all these. But what is dead? It is the body alone, we say. The soul, we say, or sometimes we say the spirit, is yet alive. Bishop Welldon agrees with that. It is the soul that possesses immortality. It is the soul that lives when the body dies. It is the soul that lives for ever. There is, he admits, a Christian doctrine which says that the body shall be raised from the dead, and shall share the immortal life of the soul. But it is Christian. It is purely a subject of revelation. It cannot be proved. There is not a single proof that can be found for it outside the Bible. 'It is a doctrine which must be accepted, if at all, upon the authority of a Divine Revelation.' On that authority he himself accepts it. But he evidently finds little in it to touch his doctrine of immortality. What is the nature of the resurrection body he cannot tell. He supposes it will be like the body of Jesus when He was transfigured. He is not quite sure why the body should be raised at all, though he suggests that it may be necessary to preserve our personal identity. He does not belittle the doctrine. But he finds no necessary place for it in his great doctrine of immortality. Immortality is the continued existence of the soul.

But what is the soul? 'It is the great disaster in our Bible,' said Canon Gore in Westminster Abbey last month, 'in our Authorized, familiar Bible, that the same word was translated sometimes "soul" and sometimes "life."' The word is *psyche* (ψυχή). Bishop Welldon knows how difficult it is to translate that word, and he does not abuse even the Authorized translators. He believes that the only way of arriving at a definition of it is to examine it historically. And when he examines it historically he finds that, outside the Bible, it has three different meanings, according as it is the soul of a plant, an animal, or a man. The soul of a plant was in Greek philosophy its life, or more strictly, its principle of growth and fertility. The soul of an animal was its life *plus* its sentient or appetitive principle. The soul of a man was his life *plus* his sentient or appetitive principle *plus* his intellectual principle or reason. Thus, according to the Greek conception, even the plant has a soul. But the soul of the animal includes greater powers than that of the plant, and the soul of man greater still. It is only, however, when we come to the Hebrew Scriptures that we find the soul in man used to cover a faculty which is so much greater than all the rest that it often receives a separate and supreme name.

Bishop Welldon does not disclose the whole Biblical doctrine of the soul. He confines himself to the psychology of St. Paul. Now St. Paul divides human nature into three elements which are distinct. The first is the body (σῶμα); the second is the soul (ψυχή), which includes the life, the sense, the affection or appetite, and the reason; the third is the spirit (πνεῦμα). The spirit is that faculty in man which only the Bible recognises. It is the faculty by which man apprehends God.

It is Bishop Welldon's belief that there is nothing clearer in St. Paul's theology than this tripartite division of the nature of man. He is body, soul, and spirit. But he believes it is equally certain that the tripartition is not always observed by St. Paul. Sometimes the 'soul' is set as a single comprehensive term against the 'spirit,' and then it includes the body. Sometimes it is set in contrast to the 'body,' so as to cover all the parts of human nature that are not visible and material, and then it includes the spirit. But

there is no confusion in that. The confusion arises only when we fail to notice that.

Now, since it is the soul in man (including the spirit) that is immortal, the importance of understanding what the soul is, becomes at once apparent. For the conception that is formed of immortality will correspond with the conception that is formed of the soul. In Homer's poetry the soul is little more than the mere vital principle. Hence when Odysseus finds Achilles in the world below and seeks to comfort him for his death by saying that he is a mighty prince among the dead as he had been among the living, Achilles answers: 'Speak not comfortably to me of death, O great Odysseus. Rather would I live on ground as the hireling of another, with a landless man who has no great livelihood, than bear sway among all the dead that be departed.' Homer stands at the beginning of pagan literature. The emperor Hadrian stands at the end. But his conception of the soul and its future was scarcely higher. Bishop Welldon quotes Matthew Prior's translation—

> Poor little pretty fluttering thing,
> Must we no longer live together?
> And dost thou prune thy trembling wing
> To take thy flight, thou know'st not whither?
> Thy humorous vein, thy pleasing folly,
> Lies all neglected, all forgot;
> And pensive, wavering, melancholy,
> Thou dread'st and hop'st thou know'st not what.

And even Socrates, standing in the middle and towering philosophically over both, has nothing better to say than, 'The hour of departure has arrived, and we go our ways, I to die, and you to live: which is better God only knows.' It was St. Paul that said, 'I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.' For St. Paul was a Hebrew and a Christian.

So when Bishop Welldon reads that Christ brought life and immortality to light, he does not understand that when Christ came men were first endowed with immortality. Men had long believed in immortality of a kind. It was another kind of immortality that Christ brought to light. He Himself usually called it by the name 'Eternal Life.' Now immortality, 'so far as experience goes,' begins at birth. 'The Eternal Life' is immortality in its perfect realization. It is the immortal life as lived in conscious intimate relation to God. It begins, says Bishop Welldon, 'not at birth, but at baptism.'

Every generation has its doubters, and the doubters of every generation have their own special reasons for doubting. In our day and generation the reasons for doubting the miraculous that surrounds the Lord Jesus Christ are found in criticism of the earliest Christian documents. Jesus of Nazareth did not claim to be miraculous, or to do miraculous deeds. The present Gospels make Jesus miraculous. But when we go back to the sources of the Gospels, and the earliest Christian records, we clear the miraculous away. That is the claim of the modern doubter, the opponent of miraculous Christianity.

And that is what makes Harnack's latest book so highly important. For Harnack is the historian of early Christianity, perhaps the leading historian of our time. His words about the books of the New Testament—their date, integrity, authorship, and the like—carry unexampled weight. He is also a believer in unmiraculous Christianity, the follower of an unmiraculous Christ. If, then, he should make it possible for us to take the Christ of the Gospels and Epistles as a reliable portrait of the actual Christ, we should know that we owe it to historical necessity, not to dogmatic bias.

Has Harnack made it possible? In the *American Journal of Theology*, for the quarter ending September, Professor Caspar René Gregory of Leipzig, writes very fully on Harnack's latest book. Professor Gregory is himself a distinguished New Testament scholar. Though he has

earned his fame as a textual critic, he is conversant with the whole field of historical study. He is a believer in a miraculous Christ. But he has as keen a sense of the claims of historic truth as Harnack. He snaps no advantage. We might even say he is somewhat ready to let advantage go. He examines Harnack's latest book from page to page, from point to point. He considers whether it is possible to believe in a miraculous Christ still. He finds it is almost inevitable now.

It is twenty years and more, says Professor Gregory, since Harnack turned his mind to the matter of early Christian literature. He had read Ritschl's *Old Catholic Church* in its second edition, and thought of editing it for a third. Then he resolved that he himself would write a History of Early Christian Literature, so he prepared himself. Not content with a knowledge of the Old Testament and a general classical education, he carefully studied the pagan literature of the period he proposed to cover. If I would understand, he said, what a *Christian* letter means, I must understand first how a heathen of the same time and place would have written it. And it is the same whether it is a letter or a petition or an apology or a panegyric or a narrative or a chronicle. He also read what others wrote. Year after year the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* published his reviews, and every review was read with interest by the scholar of Church History, for it was manifest that Harnack knew each minutest point, and all the particular surroundings of it. Then he began his *History*.

He planned his History in three parts. The first part was published in 1893. It is called *The Transmission and the Present State of the Early Christian Literature as far as Eusebius.* The second part deals with the Chronology. It is to be published in two divisions. The first division appeared in 1897. Its title is *The Chronology of the Early Christian Literature as far as Irenæus.* The second division will carry it on to Eusebius. Then the third part will contain *The Characterization of the Literature and its Internal Development.* The volume which appeared in 1897, and which carried the Chronology down to Irenæus, is the volume with which we have to do.

The volume is divided into two parts. Its first part covers 230 pages, has the general title of 'Introductory Essays,' and discusses the definitions of time in the *Church History* of Eusebius. Its second part is that which immediately concerns us. It deals with 'The Literature down to Irenæus.' The literature is not taken up in the order of the New Testament, or of any other collection in existence. Harnack's plan is to proceed from the easy to the hard, from the certain date to the uncertain. Accordingly he divides his material into 'writings that can be dated confidently within narrow limits,' and 'writings that for the present cannot be dated so.'

Well, the first thing to fix—because it is so nearly fixed already—is the chronology of St. Paul's life. Harnack fixes it in this way. St. Paul was converted, in all probability, in the year 30; that is to say, in the year of our Lord's Crucifixion, or in the year following. His first Christian visit to Jerusalem was in the year 33; his second, with the Council, in the year 47. The second missionary journey carries us onward, with the eighteen months in Corinth, to the spring of the year 50. In the winter of that year he is back to Ephesus, where he remains till 53. Next year he is made prisoner in Jerusalem, and sent down to Cæsarea. Festus comes into office in 56, and the Book of Acts closes in 59. Then the next five or six years give room for a further missionary activity, and bring us to the apostle's death in 64. Now these dates decide the dates of the great Epistles. Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans were written before the year 54, in which St. Paul was arrested in Jerusalem. Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians (if genuine) fall within the years 54 to 56 if they were written at Cæsarea, and within 57 to 59 if, as Harnack thinks more probable, they were written at Rome; while Philippians belongs,

of course, to these Roman years. Harnack does not count the Pastoral Epistles genuine. On the other hand, he argues rather for than against the genuineness of Ephesians. And even of the Pastoral Epistles he declares certain portions genuine, which is quite enough for us. For, as Professor Gregory says, 'If parts of them are genuine, it will not be hard to accept the rest in its mass as genuine.' At any rate, nobody has as yet suggested any solution of the problem that is half so plausible as the approximate genuineness.

That is the first point. The second is the definition of the year 64 as the time of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome. For Harnack considers it fairly certain that St. Peter visited Rome and died there, though he has as little belief as any of us in the notion that he ever was bishop in Rome, let alone a bishop of twenty-five years' standing. The third point is the tradition that the apostles spent twelve years at Jerusalem before they were finally 'scattered abroad,' a tradition which is closely connected with the absurdity of St. Peter's bishopric, but which Harnack, nevertheless, sees no reason to reject. The fourth point is the date of the Apocalypse. Harnack accepts the date found in Irenæus, that is, the end of Domitian's reign, say 93 to 96. The fifth and last point here is the date of the Acts and Third Gospel. For the Acts Harnack holds 80 to be the earliest, and 93 the latest, possible year. Then the Third Gospel would be not much earlier than 78, and certainly not later than 93.

These are the New Testament dates in Harnack's first part. Passing over the later writings in that part with the mere mention of the birth of Polycarp in 69, the Epistle of Clement in 93 to 95, the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp between 110 and 117, or perhaps 117 and 125, the *Shepherd* in its final form in 140, the work of Papias 145 to 160, and the death of Polycarp, February 23, 155, we come to the second part, which deals with the New Testament and other writings, whose dates and authorship are more difficult to determine.

Take first the Epistle of Barnabas. Harnack thinks that nothing hinders and everything speaks for the year 130 or 131 as its time of writing. The *Didache* is partly dependent on it, and was probably written (in some out-of-the-way corner) in the period between 131 and 160. Clement's so-called Second Epistle is probably the letter or essay sent by Soter to Corinth, and so dates from about 170, or a little earlier. Then we come to the five writings that bear the name of St. Peter, and the interest rapidly deepens.

It is no surprise to learn that Harnack does not believe in the Second Epistle of Peter. It is certainly dependent upon Jude, he says; and Professor Gregory adds that few will dispute the statement. As for Jude's Epistle—to take it in the way—Harnack insists that it does not pretend to be from the brother of Jesus, and he cannot understand how 'the quite obscure brother of the Lord,' as he elsewhere names him, could have written vv.[17. 18]. He thinks the letter was written by some one, who may not even have borne this name, between the years 100 and 130, and was afterwards embellished with the allusions to Jude. Be that as it may, and Gregory does not agree with it, for he sees no difficulty in the verses named, the Second Epistle of Peter is dependent upon it, and Professor Gregory is willing to place its date as late as 120, or even 130.

But the question of serious magnitude (for the Apocalypse of Peter and the Preaching of St. Peter need no mention here) concerns the First Epistle of St. Peter. Again Harnack denies the authenticity. It is a letter, he says, which originally had nothing to do with St. Peter. At a late date some writer, perhaps the author of 2 Peter, embellished it with the references to the Apostle Peter at the beginning, and less distinctly at the end. He cannot believe that the original writer deliberately

sat down and wrote the letter as a forgery. He could more easily believe that it is genuine. Why he cannot believe that, is because it is too dependent upon the Pauline Epistles. But Professor Gregory points out that Harnack bases this dependence upon words of Jülicher, and Jülicher's words by no means carry all they seem at first to carry. Jülicher says, that if St. Peter had written this Epistle, he would have learned more from St. Paul than from Jesus. But, says Gregory, that is a conclusion that is worse than precarious. For it undertakes to say what St. Peter would have done after he had learned from St. Paul certain new developments in the doctrine of Jesus. Grant that St. Peter had learned these new developments; he had great respect for St. Paul's learning and for his personal Christianity: what more likely than that, with the eagerness native to him, he seized upon these developments, seeing them strengthened by the great success of the apostle to the Gentiles, and wrote his letter under their influence, putting into it just such evidence of dependence as we find, rather than going back to the experiences of his disciple days? That supposition is at anyrate as likely as the other. And Gregory does admirably when he says that it is unscientific to give up a tradition that is not positive nonsense before we have a theory that leaves less to be explained.

The remaining Epistles may be touched briefly, and then to the Gospels. For the Epistle to the Hebrews, so wide a range as 65–95 is given. The author was probably Barnabas. The Pastoral Epistles began with certain letters, or fragments of letters, written by St. Paul in the years 59–64, and were wrought over and enlarged between 90 and 110. The Epistle of James was probably not a letter at all, was written between 120 and 140, and did not bear the name of James till near the end of the second century. Those are Harnack's findings. On the Epistle to the Hebrews, Gregory makes no objection. Harnack's curious attitude to the Pastorals, he has discussed already. Touching the Epistle of James, he says that it is enough that we do not know very much about it, that the guesses of Harnack are manifold enough to permit of almost anything in the way of authorship, and he adds that, where there are such intricate and doubtful conditions and relations, it is just as well to stay by the tradition, under all the doubts, as to float away into a sea of the wildest uncertainty.

We come to the Gospels. Harnack counts twenty Gospels as once in existence. But of only thirteen have we any real knowlege. Now, of all these Gospels there are only five with which we need to concern ourselves. Besides the canonical Four there is only one, and 'I should like,' says Professor Gregory, 'to express my personal satisfaction at the circumstance that only one Gospel can in any way approach so near to our canonical Four.' It is the Gospel of the Hebrews.

The great witness to the Gospel of the Hebrews is Jerome. Jerome saw it in the library at Cæsarea and elsewhere. At Bethlehem he translated it into Greek and Latin. Thrice he says it was written in Hebrew letters, once that it was composed in the Chaldee and Syriac language, eight times that the Nazarenes used it, and finally he declares roundly five times that it was the Hebrew original of the canonical Matthew. Jerome must have known that it is unlike the canonical Matthew. Perhaps he wished to boast that he had seen the original of our Greek Matthew; perhaps he wished to fall in with the tradition of four Gospels and no more. But Harnack insists upon it, that the Gospel of the Hebrews was translated into Greek long before Jerome's day, for it is cited by Origen as if it were only a Greek book, and Clement of Alexandria gives a nice Greek reading from it. In short, Harnack holds that this Gospel cannot have been written later than 100 A.D., and that nothing prevents it having been written in the sixties of the first century. 'Like Mark, it had no account of the birth of Jesus, its introduction to the baptism is the most ancient in its cast that we

have, and the other differences between it and the Four Gospels, tend for the most part, so far as they are not unimportant, to show that it is very old, and even in some points older than the canonical Gospels.'

Of the Gospel of Luke we have heard already. Harnack now fixes it down to the years 78 to 93. St. Mark he places between 65 and 85, insisting upon it that it is not necessarily to be placed after the fall of Jerusalem. He finds that the years 70–75 fit best for the Gospel according to Matthew.

The Johannean problem remains. It scarcely remains a problem. True, Harnack denies that the Apostle John is the author, though he holds that neither Apocalypse nor Gospel can be later than 110 A.D. But he denies it on the ground that when Irenæus recalled the words of Polycarp attributing the Gospel to the apostle, he made a mistake. Harnack thinks that Polycarp referred to a presbyter John, who was a very near pupil of the apostle of that name. So the whole matter turns upon that. Professor Gregory does not think that Irenæus made a mistake. Even if he did, and if the Gospel came from an intimate pupil of John, and was written before or shortly after the apostle's death, it would still, he says, be a most valuable Gospel, and not a whit less reliable than those of Mark and Luke, let alone the totally anonymous Matthew. But there is no argument of Harnack, or any other, that compels us to refuse the Gospel to St. John.

'And when He again bringeth in the first-born into the world He saith: And let all the angels of God worship Him.' The passage stands at the very opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews (it is the sixth verse of the first chapter), a passage of universally acknowledged difficulty. 'When He again bringeth in the first-born into the world'—when is that? 'And let all the angels of God worship Him'—whence are these words? Those are the two great difficulties. The *Biblical World* of August publishes an article on the passage by the Rev. W. M. Lewis, who has something definite to say about both the difficulties.

Mr. Lewis considers first whence comes the citation, 'And let all the angels of God worship Him.' Two sources have been suggested—Ps 97^{7} and Dt 32^{43}. The objections to the former are two. Firstly, the words are not the same. We see that at a glance when we lay the passages together in the Greek—

He 1^{6}, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.

Ps 97^{7}, προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ.

The greatest difference between them is the omission of καὶ, 'and.' That 'and' should have been omitted in the quotation in Hebrews would be no wonder, since it is not required there; but that it should have been inserted when not in the original passage is simply incredible. But secondly, the sense is against it also. In the Psalm the author calls upon the angels to worship Jehovah; in the Epistle the writer makes Jehovah call upon the angels to worship the Son. The argument, says Mr. Lewis, clearly requires a scriptural quotation, the reference of which to the Son or Messiah could not be disputed by the readers of the Epistle.

Why not find the source in Deuteronomy then? The words in the Greek are exactly the same, including the 'and.' The sense is the same also. For the context tells us that the speaker is Jehovah; and Jehovah summons the heavens to rejoice with *him*, the angels to worship *him*, this being some one from whom Jehovah clearly distinguishes Himself. Who is this other person? Not an angel, for the angels are called to worship Him. Not 'a' son of God, for the sons of God are encouraged to be strong in Him. To the readers of the Epistle the answer would be undisputed. He can be none

other than the First-begotten. Why then do we not choose Deuteronomy at once as the source of the quotation? The only reason seems to be that the passage is not found in the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy, it is an addition made in the Septuagint.

Now what is the event in the history of the Son of God to which the writer of the Epistle applies this citation? That is the second and the greater difficulty. The choice lies, however, between two events, the Incarnation and the Second Advent. Hitherto, at least, that seems to have been all the choice. But Mr. Lewis has another suggestion. Noticing that the word for 'world' is not the ordinary one (κόσμος), but one which signifies rather the 'civilized world' (οἰκουμένη), a word which has frequently a restricted as well as a moral meaning, he takes the writer to refer to the Jewish world or Mosaic Age. Now the First-begotten was brought into the Jewish world first in the Song of Moses. Therefore the writer simply refers to that occasion, so familiar to his Septuagint readers, upon which the words he quotes were used. He says, 'On the occasion of the first mention of the Messiah as Son of God, Jehovah says, "And let all the angels of God worship Him."'

But the most original part of Mr. Lewis's article is the argument he builds upon this for the authorship and date of the Epistle. The argument is that the Epistle to the Hebrews is the joint production of St. Paul and St. Luke, and that it was written in Cæsarea between 58 and 60 A.D. It would thus immediately follow the Epistle to the Romans.

Well, it is admitted by Westcott and others, that part of the same verse (Dt 32^{43}) is quoted by St. Paul in Ro 15^{10}. The words quoted in Romans are, 'Rejoice, ye nations, with His people'; and they follow the line, 'And let all the angels of God worship Him.' During the period of St. Paul's missionary journeys, says Mr. Lewis, the Song of Moses appears to have been much in St. Paul's mind, and was the source of frequent quotations. He even says that the Pauline Epistles may be chronologically arranged according to the order of the citations from this song. 'The rock,' in 1 Co 10^{4}, and the words, 'they sacrifice to devils, and not to God,' in 1 Co 10^{20}, are from vv.$^{4.\ 17}$ respectively of the song. The words in 2 Co 7^{5}, 'without were fightings, within were fears,' are an echo of v.^{25}.

Now in Romans 12^{19} St. Paul quotes v.^{35}, 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.' The same verse is quoted in He 10^{30}. The citation differs from the Hebrew text, and also from the Septuagint, but the words are precisely identical in both Epistles. Davidson says, 'the author may have been familiar with the Epistle to the Romans.' Westcott says, 'the passage had taken this form in practical use.' Mr. Lewis counts it much more reasonable that the same author had adopted a variation of the original, or had relied on his memory for the words of a Song that was much in his mind at a certain period, and used the same form in two Epistles which proceeded from him in close succession. In Ro 15^{10} St. Paul reaches the last verse of Moses' song, and quotes 'Rejoice, ye nations, with His people!' If he was the joint-author of Hebrews and wrote it on the occasion suggested, then the very next chapter of his writing (except the chapter of salutations in Ro 16) was the first chapter of Hebrews, 'and in the opening verses of that chapter he quotes from the same verse the words which are immediately connected with and precede those quoted at the close of the Romans, "And let all the angels of God worship Him."'

The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual.

By Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Aberdeen.

Deissmann, in his very interesting and *bahnbrechende Bibelstudien* (1895) and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897) has shown how much light is thrown upon biblical Greek by a study of the language used in the inscriptions of the centuries immediately before and, still more, after Christ, that is to say, the language used by the ordinary population, as distinguished from the literary tongue.[1] In *Bibelstudien* (p. 280 ff.) he rightly remarks on the relation of the Christian expression in the New Testament to the official language which established itself in the cultus of the emperors, such as the use of αἰώνιος, ἡ θεία δύναμις, εὐσέβεια, κυριακός (*Neue B.S.*, p. 44 ff.). In my *Church in the Roman Empire before* 170 (1893) and *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (1895), I had attempted to follow a similar path, though more on the side of action and life than on that of mere language. But, in this subject, word is correlative to action and life: the Christians were creating a new language corresponding to the new world of thought and life which was being built up for them and by them, but they did not divorce themselves from the world around them. Partly consciously, but far more in an unconscious way, they adapted their work to the life and standard of their age, and used the same devices for administration and organization which the Roman rule had worked out for itself.

The importance of studying the inscriptions of the Greek-speaking cities of Asia is twofold. In the first place, they are the only memorials which we possess of the language which Paul and Luke learned to speak in their childhood. We should be glad to possess any of the writings of Athenodorus, who was living and probably lecturing on philosophy at Tarsus when Paul was young, or of the other older Athenodorus of Tarsus, from whose writings Seneca quotes the comparison of life to a warfare, the advice to 'ask God for nothing that you cannot ask openly,' and perhaps also the counsel 'so live with men as if God saw you; so speak with God as if men heard you.'[2] Being denied that, we must content ourselves with such fragments as the inscriptions afford about the society, life, law, religion, and philosophy[3] of the time and lands in which the Pauline Churches were founded. The training of scholars in Greek has been always too much confined to the older and greater Greek literature and to the Christian books. Hence it is the difference between pagan Greek and Christian Greek which is most apparent to them, and most dwelt upon by them. They mark off 'New Testament Greek' as if it were a special and separate language, the same in the mouth of Luke the Greek as of John the Jew. They assert that phrases and words are peculiar to Christian Greek, which the epigraphists are familiar with as part of the everyday speech of the Greek Asian cities. Deissmann shows how an end is about to be put to this sort of thing.

In the second place, the epigraphic documents are the best training for the interpretation of the New Testament writings in one aspect, viz. their relation to the life of the time. Pure literature of the highest type, like the great Greek classics, on whom we are trained, is not closely bound to the circumstances of contemporary life; it becomes the heritage of the whole world, because it seizes the permanent facts of life and lays little stress on the evanescent and occasional; hence it can be appreciated on its permanent and its greatest side by one who disregards its relations to contemporary facts. No book can become part of the world's literature, unless it can be appreciated without minute study of contemporary society and life. The more dependent a literary work is on an elaborate commentary, explaining to later generations of readers the allusions, the less chance it has of living. The more it succeeds in setting before all readers men and thoughts which are sufficient in themselves and go direct and

[1] Dr. Deissmann has not observed that Canon E. L. Hicks had preceded him in illustrating the language of the New Testament from the inscriptions of the Greek cities (see two excellent papers in the *Classical Review*, 1887, pp. 4, 42). But it is only very rarely that a German scholar notices anything that is done in Britain.

[2] *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 354.

[3] Philosophy, as, *e.g.*, the doctrine of the Epicurean philosopher of Oinoanda, in Lycia, engraved on a series of blocks (*Bulletin de Corresp. Hellénique*, 1897).

unaided to the eyes and mind of all readers, the more fitted it is to become part of the literature of all ages and all men. Now, the New Testament books, while they possess in a wonderful degree the quality of emphasizing the permanent aspects of life and thought, are also, to a very remarkable extent, occasional works, written with a special eye to the circumstances and needs of the moment, assuming in the readers perfect knowledge of the whole practical situation, and explicitly stating only what has to be added to the existing and assumed facts. In this latter respect they resemble the inscriptions. To explain any inscription to a modern reader, or to understand it oneself, it is necessary to bring clearly together in imagination the entire situation in which the inscription was placed; those to whose eyes it was originally addressed were assumed to be familiar with the whole circumstances and conditions; and these the modern reader has to re-create for himself. Practice in interpreting inscriptions is therefore the best training for interpreting one side of the New Testament writings; they help to fill in the background on which the action of the New Testament takes place.

This interpretation of inscriptions must be imaginative and re-creative. The restoration of a defective inscription often depends on the revivification in fancy of the situation in which the writer of the mutilated text was. The same creative imagination is needed to read the history of Luke and the Epistles of Paul; and those who have restricted themselves to the exegesis of the written letter (which is fairly adequate for the literary, philosophical, and part of the religious side), as it is practised by the scholar sitting in his study and not looking beyond its wall, are apt to scoff at the imaginative reconstruction of the epigraphist as purely fanciful and as lacking solid basis. They say that the reconstructor thinks he can hear the grass growing; his firm hold of the essential details of the record as the skeleton round which imagination has to build up the circumstances in order to make the whole picture, they stigmatize as *Micrologie*; but it may be doubted whether they are not sometimes just a little disposed in their study to direct their imagination to the recorded facts, and the painful minuteness to the surrounding situation.

Deissmann's work will do good service if it leads professional theologians to study the inscriptions, even though their immediate purpose in doing so should be purely verbal.

In several points, as, for example, in that which is quoted in our first paragraph, and in the discussion of Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, Deissmann expresses practically the same views which have been stated by me more on the side of administration and practical work. But there is one department of epigraphy which he has omitted almost entirely, though it throws much light on his special subject, —I mean the votive or hieratic inscriptions of the non-Hellenic religion of Asia Minor. The analogy of this religion and religious expression with the Christian forms has been often in my mind while writing about Paul; and in the present paper it is proposed to make a detailed comparison of the points of analogy.

Deissmann in one case (*Bibelstudien*, p. 77) refers to the fact that words like ἁγνός, ἱερός, δίκαιος, γνήσιος, ἀγαθός, εὐσέβεια, θρησκεία, ἀρχιερεύς, etc., were familiar to the Asia Minor Christians before they began to read the Septuagint, and puts the question, whether they used such words in their Christian expression because they read them in the Greek Bible, or because they knew them in their home language. But his remarks on this point are vague and general in character. The inscriptions which we propose to consider enable us to look more exactly at the usage in regard to a few important words common to pagan ritual and Christian expression.

I. Character of the Hieratic Inscriptions.

This class of votive inscriptions has been found chiefly in the explorations of the last twenty years. They are the work of the less educated and more superstitious classes of society in Asia Minor, of those persons who had little share in Greek ideas and literature, and often only a very scanty knowledge of the Greek language. The inscriptions belong to the first three centuries of our era; and the formulæ are so persistent that they evidently form part of a technical religious language, originated by the priesthood (a more educated class) not much later and probably earlier than the Christian era. They are found chiefly in two districts, which lay off the main lines of trade and development, and which therefore longer retained the native Oriental and non-Hellenic style: one of these was the

Lydian Katakekaumene, with its ten cities,[1] and the other was the Phrygian country round Dionysopolis, which was still organized on the old Anatolian village system, without any city after the Greek style except Dionysopolis, an unimportant and unprogressive place.

Besides these two chief centres there were many others, which may hereafter yield much information, when Asia Minor is once more brought under cultivation, and the archæological wealth that lies below the surface is disclosed—provided that there are any educated persons to copy the inscribed stones, as they are taken from the earth (a duty in which many Greek residents take honourable part), before they are wrought up again into new constructions. But at present very few votive inscriptions of the kind treated in these pages are known in the rest of Asia Minor.

An instructive inscription was erected in duplicate at Laurium, in the south-east of Attica, by a Lycian slave named Xanthos, probably in the late second or the third century after Christ. He founded a *hieron* of the Anatolian god, Men Tyrannos, and drew up a code of regulations for the worshippers. Finding some difficulty in expressing himself in Greek, he made a second copy, which varies a little from the other: one is distinctly better than the other, but the better copy omits entirely the prohibition against a murderer engaging at all in the worship of the God: the murderer is permanently impure, whereas the impurity incurred by other faults enumerated lasts only for a certain number of days. This text is almost the only one of those studied in the following paper that is referred to by Deissmann (see *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 52).

It will be plain to every reader on the one hand how close is the analogy in language between these hieratic inscriptions and the Christian teaching, and on the other hand how broad and absolute is the contrast between them. There is only one inscription as to which the thought of Christian origin could for a moment rise to the mind of any ordinary human being; and that is an inscription of three words — verb, preposition, and proper name—εὐλογοῦμεν ὑπὲρ Ἑρμοφίλου; and there the doubt is possible only because of the emptiness of the text. Obviously there is no opening for hesitation as to the Christian or pagan origin of any inscription, if anything beyond a single vague generality is contained in it. The words common to the inscriptions and the Christian documents are many and important; but when several of them come together in a Christian writing they have a depth of meaning and an individuality that mark it off unmistakably from a pagan compostion.

Let us turn aside for a moment to apply this result to the controversy that has raged in Germany as to the origin of the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus. Here we have a document of considerable length, which describes the most sacred and fundamental points in Christian teaching and belief. It contains not a single word which is not common to paganism; every single point and detail in it can be paralleled from some pagan document or other, as has been proved with much ingenuity and learning by several writers. Misled by this fact, many profound and distinguished theologians have maintained that the epitaph is a pagan composition. But they that have eyes to see and a mind to feel perceive that the life and spirit of this document moves in a Christian medium and on a Christian level of thought. The scholars who maintain its pagan origin have, by looking at the details, blinded themselves to the life and character of the whole; they have forgotten that in thought the whole is different from, and greater than, the sum of its parts; they see the parts, and they miss the whole; they handle the component materials, while they are blind to the life that animates these elements and makes them into a unified organism. Yet these same scholars,[2] who show themselves so little able to recognize an original Christian document when it is placed single and complete before their eyes and judgment, entertain no hesitation as to chopping up various books of the New Testament; they trust their judgment implicitly as to the origin of every paragraph, almost of every sentence; they distinguish unerringly (but never to the satisfaction of any rival critic) the varying origin of each sentence, and tell exactly the decade —almost the year in some cases—when each paragraph or sentence was written, and what was the attitude and intention of the writer.

They should first convince us that they can

[1] See *Acta S. Pionii* (1st Feb. p. 43) and *Histor. Geogr. As. Min.* p. 132.

[2] I refer not merely to those who have publicly written on the subject, but also to others, who have privately indicated their views, though I must not name them, until they choose to make their opinion public.

distinguish a Christian document from a pagan before they ask us to believe that they can distinguish a Christian document of one decade from one of another. Are they not in the latter case missing the life while they cut up the single sentences, just as they miss it in the former case?

The resemblance of the hieratic language to that of Paul (and in almost an equal degree of Luke) is especially striking. It is characteristic of Paul's teaching that he should take up the religious terms that were peculiar to his hearers and readers, and give them back with a deeper import: 'What ye ignorantly worship, that declare I unto you.' A large number of the characteristic Pauline words and terms were already familiar to his Gentile converts; and Paul never sought to destroy, but only to direct and develop the germs of religious feeling among them.

There is also a marked analogy in the inscriptions to the Old Testament language and tone. The religion of Asia Minor is practically identical in character with the primitive Semitic idolatry, out of which the Hebrews rose, into which they were always tending to glide back, which was the untutored expression of their religious nature, upon which the religion given by Divine revelation to them had to be built up; and therefore the analogy is just what might be expected. It shows itself in many expressions and words and thoughts. Yet along with the analogy there is that essential difference, which makes those who are most struck with the analogy in certain points most profoundly convinced that by no ordinary and natural process of purification and elevation could the primitive Semitic religion develop into the Jewish religion. Nothing can explain the difference except an external factor, the direct action of a Divine power from above on the inert and unvitalized religious ritual of primitive Semitism. In saying this I am merely repeating what my first guide in these matters, Professor Robertson Smith, has often said in private conversation and also in his published works.

In many cases the word which is used in common in the pagan and the Christian language is the natural Greek term, which might be used by the Christians, even if it had not been used by the pagans. But the essential point is that the terms which had become technical in paganism were not avoided. Paul must have known what religious sense had been taken from such words as *αἰώνιος*, *σωτηρία*, *ἐξομολογέομαι*, *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ*, *εὐλογία*, *καθαρός*, etc., by those to whom he was writing, and he deliberately uses them. On the other hand there were terms which he never uses, because they implied idolatry; the religious words he adopts and deepens, the words that were too closely connected with idolatry he avoids (*St. Paul the Trav.* p. 146 f.). Take, for example, the words connected with *ἱερός*, *ἱερόν*, *ἱερεύς*, *ἀρχιερεύς*, *ἱερατεία*, *ἱεράτευμα*, *ἱερατεύω*, *ἱερόθυτος*, *ἱεροπρεπής*, *ἱεροσυλέω*, *ἱερόσυλος*, *ἱερουργέω*, *ἱερωσύνη*. Paul uses *ἱερόθυτος*, *ἱεροσυλέω*, *ἱερόν*, *ἱερός*, each once. The two former occur in allusions to pagan ritual, which shows that he fully appreciated the idolatrous associations of these words. The other two, *ἱερὸν* and *ἱερός*, occur together in a description of the practice at the temple in Jerusalem (1 Co 9^{13}).

Otherwise Paul pointedly avoids the whole group, except that *ἱεροπρεπής* and *ἱερός* are used in a Christian way in Tit 2^{3}, 2 Ti 3^{15}, and (as if to bar the argument that only the Pastoral author and not the real Paul used such terms) he has *ἱερουργέω* in Ro 15^{16}. On the other hand, some words of this group (not *ἱερός*) are frequently used throughout the rest of the New Testament; they are used almost exclusively in relation to Jewish ritual, but are found in a distinctly Christian application (evidently under the influence of the Septuagint) in 1 P $2^{5.\ 9}$, Rev 1^{6} 5^{10} 20^{6}, and often in He, and later the Christian use became much more frequent. But *λειτουργὸς*, *λειτουργία*, *λειτουργέω*, which had chiefly a political sense in pagan society, are used freely by Paul (Ro 13^{6} $15^{16.\ 27}$, 2 Co 9^{12}, Ph $2^{17.\ 25.\ 30}$); still more commonly does he use *διάκονος*, *διακονία*, for though *διάκονος* is used occasionally to designate officials in pagan temples, yet the characteristic connexion of the name was not with idolatry.

For convenience of arrangement I divide the hieratic inscriptions into classes, but this division cannot be carried out thoroughly. Those of one class shade off by imperceptible degrees into other classes, and constantly require to be illustrated by those of another class. But some order is necessary in this exposition; and classification is the only way in which order can be attained.

Except the peculiar case of Xanthos's inscriptions, which are two drafts of the foundation deed of an amateur *hieron*, the series of documents here discussed were engraved on *stelai*, or on tablets, or on altars, dedicated at the *hieron* of Artemis-Leto and Apollo-Lairbenos, near Dionys-

opolis, and at the *hieron* of Artemis-Anaïtis and Men Tiamou or Tyrannos, at Satala, in the Lydian Katakekaumene. A very large proportion of these end with the word εὐχήν (governed by some such verb as ἀνέθηκεν or ἀνέστησεν understood), 'So-and-so dedicated his prayer.' The strict sense of εὐχή, a prayer and vow, to these Anatolian peasants must be kept in mind.

II. Prayer and Vow.

In the pagan conception, the relation of God and man is quite one of trade and business. The worshipper has a request to make of the god. He vows that if the god grants his request he will pay the god such and such a requital for his gift. The prayer, or request for aid, is necessarily coupled with a vow or promise of payment. The two elements, prayer and vow, are mutually complementary, like lock and key: the one is useless and meaningless without the other; where the one is mentioned, the other must always be understood. The word εὐχή, which is so common in these inscriptions, indicates, like *votum* in Latin, both elements, the prayer and the vow; and sometimes the one is more prominent in thought, sometimes the other.

The idea of payment vanishes almost entirely in the Christian teaching. In the New Testament εὐχή is used only by Luke in the sense of a vow of the old type, and by James (5^{15}), where it has the sense of prayer; but the verb εὔχομαι is more frequently used of prayer in Ac, Ro, 2 Co, Ja, and 3 Jn. The compounds προσευχή and προσεύχομαι are the ordinary terms used. Was εὐχή felt to be too much connected with the idea of a vow and a gift promised to God?

The commonest object of pagan vows and prayers is salvation and preservation, σωτηρία; vows are made and thanks returned, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἰδίας σωτηρίας, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας καὶ τῶν τέκνων; and so on. The word was taken up in the Christian teaching; the object of all men is salvation, and the way or the word of salvation is taught in the Christian documents, ὁδὸς σωτηρίας (Ac 16^{17}), λόγος σωτηρίας (Ac 13^{26}). The exact familiar phrase, ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας, occurs in 2 Co 1^{6}, and περὶ σωτηρίας (the preposition is found, though rarely, in pagan inscriptions of this kind) in Jude v.[3].

Prayers and vows are also found on account of general bodily health, or the health of some part of the body, ὑπὲρ ὑγιείας,[1] ὑπὲρ ὑγιείας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ποδός, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁλοκληρίας των ποδων, or on behalf of one's property, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἡμιόνου, ὑπὲρ τοῦ κολασθέντος βοός.

The verb ὑγιαίνω and the adjective ὑγιής are used occasionally in a religious sense in the Epistles to Titus and Timothy, διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα, λόγον ὑγιῆ, λόγοι ὑγιαίνοντες (1 Ti 1^{10} 6^{3}, 2 Ti 1^{13} 4^{3}, Tit $1^{9.\,13}$ $2^{1.\,8}$; comp. 2^{2}).

A remarkable phrase occurs in an inscription of the Katakekaumene. In the year 96 A.D., on the first day of the year,[2] Menandros paid his vow to the Meter Taszene, φυλακτήρι(ο)ν λαβών. In the sense of 'amulet' φυλακτήριον is common in the magical papyri; and the Jews wore on the left arm and forehead as *phylakteria* strips of parchment inscribed with texts of Scripture (Mt 23^{5}). Except in reference to this Jewish custom, the word could not be expected in the New Testament. It is interesting to find that *phylakteria* were given by the goddess to her worshippers: probably this amulet, given on the first day of the first month, was intended to be efficacious for a whole year.

There were cases in which the worshipper did not recognize when his prayer was granted, and omitted to pay his vow. In this case the god reminds him, and demands payment (see sec. x.).

[1] Almost always the less accurate form ὑγεία is used.

[2] The inscription (copied by me in 1884) has been published by Dr. Buresch in his *Aus Lydien* (1898, p. 83). He has failed to understand the date, which is [μηνὸς] Δείου Νο(υμηνίᾳ), 'On the first day of Deios, the first month.'

Requests and Replies.

Can one of your learned readers tell us about those *very large type* sentences in both O.T. and N.T.? *e.g.* Jer. xxiii. 6, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS; John xix. 19, etc. How many are there so printed in the A.V.? What is their history?

In the R.V. the Oxford printers seem to have put the O.T. ones back into ordinary type, and left the N.T. ones in small capitals.—J. F. H.

The notation appears in the following places, according to Scrivener's critical edition of the Authorized Version:—Ex 3^{14} 28^{36} (= 39^{30} and Zec 14^{20}), Dt 28^{58}, Dn 5^{25-28}, Mt 27^{37} (and parallels), Ac 17^{23}, Rev 17^{5} 19^{16}. In the use of capitals the Authorized Translators followed their predecessors of the Genevan and the Rheims N.T. Naturally, in a matter depending entirely on individual taste, there was variety in the details; even editions of the A.V. do not always agree. In the above case the Revisers use capitals, but they do not make any difference between these and the small capitals used to represent the Hebrew *Jehovah* (*Yahweh*) when translated *Lord* or *God*. The reason for the notation is generally obvious. It is employed when a phrase is used as a name, or when a phrase or a word appears as a kind of placard or title. In Jer 23^{6} the R.V. drops the capitals, having altered the phrase title to a sentence ('*The Lord is our Righteousness*'). In Zec 3^{8} and 6^{12} the A.V. uses large capitals for the title '*the Branch*'; the R.V. drops them, doubtless because many other titles in a single word would make the same claim. An exception is fairly made in the first announcement of the name *Jesus* (Mt $1^{21.25}$, Lk 1^{31}), where the A.V. with large capitals and the R.V. with small bring out the emphasis of this significant name. There remain the cases where the names *Jah* and *Jehovah* are retained in translation. In Is 12^{2} and 26^{4} they appear together, and the A.V. prints 'the LORD JEHOVAH,' the R.V. being content with small capitals for both. I should imagine that the use of these large capitals in the A.V. was prompted by a wish to distinguish between the ordinary and the special use, a distinction not really worth making. The A.V. has large capitals for the name *Jehovah* wherever it occurs; the R.V. has ordinary Roman in Is 49^{14}, a place in which the A.V. had the normal equivalent ('*the LORD*'). So with the form *Jah*, which the R.V. brings in for Ps 89^{8} (A.V. only in Ps 68^{4}).

No particular principle is involved in the use of this device of printing. It might easily be extended: *e.g.* in Rev 19^{13} the title '*the Word of God*' has much the same claim as that in v.^{16} ('*King of kings*'); and the last words of Ezekiel, '*The LORD is there*,' and St. Paul's '*Maran atha*,' in 1 Co 16^{22}, might very well have been thus printed. A wider use of such typographical resources would, in my opinion, considerably improve our Bibles.

James Hope Moulton.

Cambridge.

I was busy making notes from the article in *The Expository Times* for August 1898 on the Greek of LXX, when I suddenly came on the statement that λειτουργέω (acc. to Cremer) does not belong to profane Greek. My lexicon is far away at Cambridge, but surely there is the famous phrase in Demosthenes, ὅσας λειτουργίας λελειτούργηκε, which Macaulay's Indian rendered, 'How many times he had performed divine service' Would you kindly explain a little. And would you also inform me if Deissmann is intelligible to a person who has very little German, and if he has ransacked all the papyri recently published? Has he, for example, any instances of ξυναρμολογουμένη?—J. H. A. H.

Deissmann quotes Cremer (7th ed.) to this effect: 'The LXX took over the word (λειτουργέω) for the ministry of the priests and Levites in the temple, for which the usage in profane Greek gave no direct occasion, since only one word of this family, λειτουργός, is used of priests only at a late date and very seldom.' Deissmann then proceeds to contest this from papyri of the second century B.C., both as to the verb and the noun. Of course Cremer's statement refers only to use in religious services, not in State service.

Deissmann seems to have ransacked the published collections of papyri pretty thoroughly.

He writes in an animated and picturesque, and not very difficult, style.

J. S. Banks.

Headingley College, Leeds.

Is there any recent literature on the religious beliefs of the Ancient Egyptians which you can recommend to a beginner in the study of Comparative Religions? —A. D. E.

In the new edition of his *Land of the Monuments*, Mr. Pollard names the following works on that subject:—(1) *The Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul*, by Dr. A. Wiedemann. 1896. Twenty-one illustrations. 3s. (2) *The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, by the same author. Seventy-three illustrations. 12s. 6d. (3) *Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt*, by Professor Petrie. 1898. 2s. 6d.

Editor.

I should be obliged if one of your contributors would inform me, through the medium of *The Expository Times*, where the question of the language spoken by our Lord is discussed? Expositors usually assume that our Lord habitually spoke in Greek; I should like to know how far this assumption is warranted.—M. M. T.

In answering this question I suppose I may be pardoned in referring to my own book, entitled *Greek the Language of Christ and His Apostles* (Longmans & Co.). In this work the question will be found discussed in all its bearings, and proofs of a manifold kind brought forward to show that Greek was the language habitually used by Christ in all His public addresses to the people.

The correspondent adds that 'Expositors usually assume that our Lord habitually spoke in Greek.' This is undoubtedly true, if you attend only to their expositions of Christ's words, but these same writers will nevertheless be found maintaining, often with overbearing confidence, that the customary language of Christ was not Greek, but something which they are pleased to call Syro-Chaldaic, the very existence of which may be disputed! I need hardly say further that this question as to the language commonly used by Christ is, as I have shown in the work above referred to, in many of its applications, of the highest practical importance.

Alex. Roberts.

St. Andrews.

Can you recommend me the best critical commentary on Isaiah ii? I enclose card.—Scholastica.

It is a little difficult to answer 'Scholastica's' question directly, as the answer must depend in part upon her own needs and capacities, on neither of which I have any information. In the abstract, I consider Dillmann's *Commentary* (in the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch*) to be the best critical commentary on Isaiah ii. There are, however, many critical questions connected with these prophecies which are discussed a good deal more fully in Cheyne's *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895). In case 'Scholastica' is not acquainted with German, I should recommend Cheyne's *Prophecies of Isaiah* (3rd ed., 1884), his recently published translation (with notes) in *The Polychrome Bible*, and the *Introduction* just mentioned, to be supplemented, where necessary, on exegetical points, by the last edition of Delitzsch's *Commentary* (translated). A very useful and well-written commentary, presupposing and summarizing the principal critical conditions, but not discussing critical problems so fully as the first-mentioned works of Dillmann and Cheyne, and without the same constant reference to the Hebrew, is the one by Skinner, which has appeared this year in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*.

S. R. Driver

Oxford.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

For the session which begins with November 1898 and ends with June 1899, we propose to study the First Book of Psalms (*i.e.* Psalms i.–xli.) and the First Epistle of St. Peter.

The cheapest good commentaries on both subjects will be found in the Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges. The volume on the Psalms is by Professor Kirkpatrick, that on St. Peter by the late Dean Plumptre.

The Unity of Deuteronomy.

By Professor Ed. König, Ph.D., D.D., Rostock.

In the German translation of *Lex Mosaica* (1898, p. 61) we read: 'About the unity of the fifth book of Moses there is no question; it is generally admitted' (die Einheit des fünften Buches Moses kommt weiter nicht in Frage; sie wird allgemein anerkannt). But it is known that from so early a date as that of the Talmudists this unity has been viewed as only relative. For in the famous passage of the Bab. Talmud (*Baba bathra* fol. 14^b 15^a) the narrative of Moses' death, etc. (Dt 34^{5-12}), is denied to be from Moses' own pen (see translation of the whole passage in my article, 'The History and Method of Pentateuchal Criticism,' in the *Expositor*, 1896, pp. 82 ff.). Again, Carpzov (*Introductio*, p. 137) remarked, 'Pervulgata omnium est confessio caput 34 integrum vel a v. 5 saltem ad finem ab auctore alio fuisse profectum.' Even Rupprecht, in his self-styled *Lösung des Pentateuchräthsels* (1897, ii. 2, p. 229), says that 'probably Joshua added the closing narrative from 32^{48} onwards.' But the unity of Dt on a larger scale has been rightly called in question by others. I do not now purpose, however, to speak of the views that have been proposed, down to the year 1893, regarding the composition of the fifth book of the Pentateuch. An account of these is given in my *Einleitung* (pp. 209–224), where one may find also my own opinion about the tradition that in Dt we inherit a work of Moses, as well as an account of those features in the language and the contents of that book which show that this inheritance has not been preserved all through the centuries without modification.

My present intention is rather to deal with a hypothesis as to the unity of Dt which has been started since 1894, the hypothesis, namely, maintained by Carl Steuernagel in four different writings. These bear the following titles:—*Der Rahmen des Dt* (Inauguraldissertation, Leipzig, 1894); *Biblisch-theologische Untersuchung über die Entstehung des deuteronom. Gesetzes* (Habilitationsschrift, Halle, 1895); *Die Entstehung des deuteronom. Gesetzes* (1896); *Das Deuteronomium übersetzt u. erklärt* (Handkomm. Z.A.T., 1898). The essential points of his hypothesis are as follows:—The middle portion of Dt, *i.e.* 4^{44}-30^{20}, is a combination of two writings, which are differentiated from one another particularly by their use of 'thou' and 'ye' respectively, and which on that account he indicates by the symbols Sg (=Singular) and Pl (=Plural). Sg, according to Steuernagel (*Dt*, 1898, pp. iv. v. viii.), includes $6^{4f.\ 10-13.\ 15}$ $7^{1-4a.\ 6.\ 9.\ 12b.-16a.\ 17-21.\ 23f.}$ $8^{2-5.\ 7-14.\ 17f.}$ $9^{1-4a.\ 5-7a}$ $10^{12.\ 14f.\ 21.(22\ ?)}$ $11^{10-12.\ 14f.}$ $12^{13f.}$ $16-20a.\ 21.\ 26f.$ $14^{22-23a\alpha.\ 24-27a.\ 28-29a.}$ $15^{19f.}$ $16^{1f.\ 5-7.\ 9-11.}$ $13-15.\ 18*$ $17^{8*.\ 10b.}$ $18^{1-2*.\ 3f.\ 6.\ 8}$ $19^{2.\ 3b.\ 4-8a.\ 9b.\ 10*.\ 15-19a*}$ $13^{2-4a.\ 6-10a\alpha*.\ 11b.\ 13f.\ 16-18}$ $20^{10-17a\alpha.\ 19f.}$ $22^{1-4.\ 6-7a.\ 8}$ $23^{16-17*.\ 20.\ 25f.}$ $24^{(6).\ 10-22}$ (25^4) $15^{1f.\ 7-15.\ 18}$ $25^{1-3\ 11-12a}$ $26^{2*.}$ $5-15a$ $28^{1-8a.\ 12-13a.\ 15-20*.\ 23-25a.\ 43-46}$ $30^{15.\ 19b-20}$.

It will not be superfluous, I think, to test this hypothesis, for up till now it has scarcely received any criticism, either in Germany or in England. Even Dr. Driver in his excellent *Commentary on Deuteronomy* (1895) and in the sixth edition of his *Introduction* (1897, p. 70) does nothing more than mention two writings of Steuernagel's, adding the remark, 'Both are attempts to analyze Dt into pre-existing groups of laws.' Besides, a linguistic investigation with which I am occupied at present, puts me in a position to pass judgment on the principal argument of Steuernagel. At the same time I will examine the other grounds upon which (*Dt*, 1898, pp. ii. ff.) he builds his hypothesis.

1. In the first place, he says: 'The book has a double superscription, 4^{44} and 4^{45}. Nor is it of any avail to strike out either v.[44] or v.[45], for in either case it would remain inexplicable how a redactor should have added the second superscription.' But this is an incorrect statement of the position. Let us look at the four ways in which it has been sought to remove the above difficulty. (*a*) Both verses have been attributed to one and the same author (so Dillm., *Numeri, Deut. u. Josua*, 1886, *ad loc.*). In that case we have here one of the traces, not a few in number, of that pleonastic mode of expression which is not infrequent in Dt (cf. 'all the commandments and the statutes and the judgments,' 5^{28} [Eng. 5^{31}], 7^{11}; cf. 8^{11} 11^1 30^{16}, or 'with all thy heart,' etc., 6^5, etc.). —(*b*) It is possible that only the words 'and this is the law,' etc. (4^{44}), are original, and that the words 'these are the testimonies,' etc. (4^{45}), may have been added because in other portions of Dt

there is mention of 'the testimonies and the statutes and the judgments' (6^{20}), or at least of 'the statutes and the judgments' ($4^{1.\ 5.\ 8.\ 14}$ $5^{1.\ 28}$ 11^{32} 12^{1} 26^{16}).—(*c*) A third view is that the original introduction to chaps. 5 ff. is contained in $4^{45\ (46\text{-}49)}$, and that 4^{44} is interpolated. In that case the words 'this is the law,' etc. (4^{44}), might serve two purposes. They might form a connecting link between the introductory part 1^{1}–$4^{40\ (41\text{-}43)}$ and $4^{45ff.}$ (cf. my *Einleitung*, p. 212 f.), and they might supplement the notion of the *Torah* (the law) which stands in the foreground of chaps. 5 ff. Who will deny with certainty that some one of these three views is possible?—(*d*) Yet Steuernagel denies it in the words above cited, and in his opinion (*Dt*, 1898, p. 20) the words 'and this is the law,' etc. (4^{44}), formed the introduction to the document Sg, whereas the document Pl began with the words 'these are the testimonies,' etc. (4^{45}). In this way then Steuernagel himself admits that at least the redactor of Sg and Pl regarded it as possible that the two statements, 4^{44} and 4^{45}, should stand side by side. Further, Steuernagel himself calls attention to the fact that the notion 'set before' is expressed in Sg by נָתַן לִפְנֵי ($30^{15\ (19)}$), yet in 4^{44} we have שִׂים לִפְנֵי. Consequently, this view of $4^{44f.}$ is neither the only possible nor the most probable one.

2. Steuernagel, in *Rahmen des Dt* (1894, p. 26 f.) and in *Dt* (1898, p. ii. iv. 21. 39) posits a contradiction between 5^{3} $11^{2ff.}$ and 8^{2}. He asserts that according to the first two of these passages the speaker addressed the generation which was assembled at Horeb and was on the point of marching thence, whereas according to 8^{2} he spoke to the next generation which was on the point of crossing the Jordan. But—

(*a*) 5^{3} does not at all imply that the address of Moses was delivered at Horeb. Steuernagel has overlooked the local circumstances contained in $5^{2f.}$. For in 5^{2} it is said, 'Jahweh our God made a covenant with us in Horeb.' If the audience had been still assembled at Horeb, this mode of expression would be unnatural. Moreover, upon this supposition, we should not expect a 'here' (פֹּה, 5^{3}) to be added to the expression 'in Horeb' (5^{2}). Further, the text 5^{3b} does not contain the word 'stehen' as does Steuernagel's translation, 'Die wir hier heute alle lebend *stehen*.'

(*b*) The generation which was upon the point of crossing the Jordan, consisted in part of persons who had actually stood at Horeb. Let one recall, for instance, Moses himself, Caleb and Joshua, Eleasar and others. Hence in characterizing the individuals to whom, according to the narrative of Dt, Moses delivered his last addresses, the emphasis might fall in two different directions. On the one hand, it might be emphasized that they along with Moses had witnessed the deliverance from Egypt (5^{3} 11^{2}); on the other hand, prominence might be given to the fact that they had experienced the dangers of the wilderness wanderings (8^{2}).

(*c*) After all, the expressions employed in 5^{3b} contain a difficulty which I will attempt to remove. For 5^{3b} reads literally, 'but with *us*, these (namely) who are here alive to-day.' The words 'these,' etc., form an apposition (Driver, *ad loc.*). Steuernagel, to be sure, renders, 'But us who are all here alive to day' (sondern uns, die wir hier heute am Leben sind). He thus simply passes by the word 'these.' The same course is followed in Kautzsch's *Uebersetzung des A.T.*, where 5^{3b} receives the pretty arbitrary rendering, 'But with us the living, with us all who are here to-day' (sondern mit uns den Lebenden, mit uns allen, die wir heute hier sind). Other exegetes (Dillmann, Oettli) translate the word 'these': Dillmann's rendering being 'Diesen da, die wir hier heute alle lebend sind.' But they seem to me to have equally failed to appreciate the sense of this apposition. The addition 'these,' etc., is (α) most likely due to the circumstance that the preceding 'us' did not include the whole body of persons with whom Jahweh had spoken at Horeb. This 'us' had to be explained or rather limited in its application by an apposition. It is meant to convey the sense 'with these (at least) who,' etc., *i.e.* 'in so far as we,' etc. Or (β) was it the intention of the speaker to widen the application of 'us' by this apposition? Did he mean to say that the 'us' also included such persons as had not stood with Moses and others at Horeb? This is possible, but scarcely so probable. For in that case we should have expected the כֹּל ('all') at the beginning of the apposition, so that the latter would have read, 'all these who,' etc. Or (γ) was 'these' of 5^{3b} intended to express the sense 'none of us has died' (Steuernagel, *Dt*, 1898, p. 21)? But it would have least of all occurred to the speaker to emphasize this if, as Steuernagel thinks, the address that follows 5^{3} was delivered at Horeb.

Besides, the form of the apposition '(with) these who here this day are all alive' would be unnatural, if the speaker desired to express the idea 'with us, of whom no one has died up to this day.' And, finally, to emphasize this would have been to suggest the thought that the covenant was not made also with the following generations.

3. A third support for his new partition of Dt is discovered by Steuernagel (*Dt*, 1898, p. ii. f. 42) in the disordered condition of Dt 12–26. He says (p. ii), 'In the law we miss any plan according to which its prescriptions are arranged.' But—

(*a*) The correctness of this view-point is itself uncertain. The judgment whether the presentation of a subject follows a plan or not, is always to a certain extent an individual judgment. But in addition to this I would point out that Steuernagel, in speaking even of the code of laws which he attributes to Pl (12^{1*} (?) $^{8.\ 9.*\ 10f.\ 12*}$ 16^{21}–17^{7}, etc.), says, 'Ein das Ganze beherrschender Plan fehlt.' And yet he ascribes this questionable code to *one* author, his Pl. Consequently, he has deprived himself of the right to contest the unity of Dt 12–26 upon the ground that in this part of Dt a plan is wanting.

(*b*) Again, even the particular phenomena in which Steuernagel discovers a want of arrangement in the laws, are not all quite certain. Let us examine his principal examples. He specially emphasizes the circumstance that $13^{2\text{-}18}$ and $17^{2\text{-}7}$ are separated from each other. But the contents of these two sections are not identical, the first dealing with the *temptation to* idolatry, the second describing the *act of* idolatry. The leading aim of $13^{2ff.}$ is to stir up opposition to a temptation, that of $17^{2\text{-}7}$ is to prescribe the judicial procedure to be adopted against such persons as have actually been denounced as worshippers of the sun, moon, and stars. Precisely from this point of view the latter section might well be placed in the context of $16^{18ff.}$. Further, Steuernagel points out how a certain duty which had to be discharged every *third* year ($14^{28f.}$) has an observance attached to it which concerns every *seventh* year ($15^{1ff.}$). But $24^{10\text{-}13}$ might have been taken into a series of sections whose main idea is humanity. Finally, repetitions like $12^{5\text{-}7.\ 11f.}$ are a feature of the pleonastic character of the diction of Dt, and the speaker might repeat an exhortation several times in order to make a greater impression.

4. Likewise the variety as regards the use of the *third* and the *second* person has given Steuernagel occasion to doubt the unity of Dt. Regarding $23^{18f.}$ he says, 'These two verses proceed from different sources; for while in v.^{18} Israel is spoken of in the third person, in v.^{19} it is addressed directly' (*Dt*, 1898, p. 86). But, in the first place, the correctness of this argumentation is rendered doubtful by Steuernagel himself. For he derives 23^{19} from the same source as 22^{5}, and yet in 22^{5} it is the third person, while in 23^{19} it is the second person that is used. Secondly, Steuernagel has not observed that elsewhere also in the legislative portions of the O.T., immediately after commands which apply to a third person, there come commands in which the direct address is employed: Ex (cf. $21^{13b.\ 14b}$) ^{23b} $22^{17.\ 20}$, Lv 20^{19a} stand in exactly the same relation to their preceding context as does Dt 23^{19}. Thirdly, in other passages of the O.T. as well we find in immediate succession one and the same object spoken of as a third person or addressed as a second person. This is the case in Gn 49^{25a}, Dt $32^{15a\beta.\ 17b\beta}$, Is 1^{5} 3^{25}, and in many other passages, which will be noticed in another *Untersuchung* which I intend to publish. This evidence further throws light on a remark made by Steuernagel on Dt 33^{3}, 'The transition to direct address is strange'; and when he adds, 'Lucian, judging from his αὐτοῦ, must rather have read יָדָיו,' this notion that every element in a version reproduces the original text is as ill founded as it is widely prevalent.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

The Literature of Genesis.

THERE is no book of the Old Testament, not even the Psalter itself, that is better provided with commentaries of the first rank than Genesis. Mr. Spurrell's *Notes on the Text of Genesis* should be used by the Hebrew student first. Mr. Spurrell tells us that the volume was undertaken at the suggestion of Professor Driver, and it is not unworthy to stand beside Dr. Driver's own *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, although it demands less knowledge of the language. The second edition, greatly improved, was published in 1896 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.).

Besides the great German commentaries, which of course work upon the Hebrew, mention should be made of Kalisch's *Historical and Grammatical Commentary on the Old Testament*. There is a purely English edition of the Genesis and the Exodus volumes, as well as the Hebrew and English one, but the latter is greatly superior. Kalisch has never taken the place he deserves. Scholars have difficulty in placing him, for he belongs to no school, and they mostly pass him by. The unlearned fear to put their trust in him. But he is not more often wrong than any other of the great commentators, and he is always suggestive—the supreme excellence of any commentator (Longmans. 18s.).

Of the German commentaries that have been translated into English, the best known is Delitzsch. The latest edition of Delitzsch's Genesis, which goes by the name of *A New Commentary on Genesis*, was skilfully translated into English by Miss Taylor, and published by T. & T. Clark, in two volumes, in 1888–89 (21s.). The value of Delitzsch's Genesis is very great; it is so full, so earnest, so religious. Yet if we were restricted to one commentary on Genesis, it is not Delitzsch we should choose but Dillmann. The wealth of learning which Dillmann's pages carry is amazing. One feels that everything is here—introduction, textual criticism, exegesis, exposition, archæology—and yet the work is easier to read and to use than even Delitzsch. But perhaps the most surprising thing in Dillmann is his *finality*. Even in matters of archæology he has seized the essential things in the discoveries that have been made, and later discoveries have added somewhat to his illustrations, but never, so far as we have seen, overturned his conclusions. The English edition suffered from delay, but it is a good one now, and wherever the student or preacher has anything to do with Genesis, he will find Dillmann his best and only necessary guide (2 vols., 21s.).

It is the element of finality that is most conspicuously absent from our largest English commentaries, such as the 'Speaker' (Browne), 'Ellicott' (Payne Smith), and the 'Pulpit' (Whitelaw). If he is to live for ever, the commentator, as well as the poet, must be a genius. For, like the poet, he has to separate truth from convenience, and even from conventionality. But there are smaller books that deserve mention, especially F. W. Robertson's *Notes on Genesis*, which will never grow old; and Marcus Dods' *Genesis* in the 'Handbooks for Bible Classes,' and in the 'Expositor's Bible.'

GENESIS i. 1.

'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.'

EXPOSITION.

'In the beginning.'—This is the rendering of the versions and most commentators. The phrase must not be taken relatively, *i.e. first of all*, in opposition to a second or third which might follow, for this is against the sense as heaven and earth include all. But it must be taken absolutely: 'at first.'—DELITZSCH.

'God.'—The Hebrew is *Elohim*, the usual designation of God among the Hebrews. It is hardly to be derived from the specifically Arabic *'aliha*, 'to be timid, to be anxious,' as if it meant 'object of fear.' On the whole it is not to be separated from (the older) *El*, and the use of *El* in Gn 31^{29} favours most the rendering 'Might.'—DILLMANN.

'Created.'—In this and the following chapter four words are used to express God's action in creation. They may be represented by our words *create*, *make*, *form*, *build*. Not even the first of these (which is the word used in this verse) can be said to express, certainly and invariably, the idea of creation out of nothing. It originally or etymologically expresses the *hewing* and *cutting* by which, *e.g.*, a forest is cleared (Jos $17^{15\text{-}18}$), and it is sometimes used synonymously with *make* or *form* (Is 45^{18} 43^{7}). But it is true, as Moses Stuart says, that 'if this word does not mean to create in the highest sense, then the Hebrews had no word by which they

could designate this idea.' And very significantly one part of this verb (the part here employed) is never used of human action, but is appropriated to Divine agency. It would seem, however, as if the idea of creation out of nothing were not here in view. The writer merely desires to refer the origin of the known world, *the heaven and the earth*, to God; and he does not consider the eternity of matter.—Dods.

'**The heaven and the earth.**'—Among the Hebrews, as among other peoples, this is the usual designation of the conception *world*, for which the Old Testament has no single expression.—Dillmann.

'The earth and the heavens' always mean the terrestrial globe with its aërial firmament.—Whitelaw.

Methods of Treatment.

I.

Faith in a Creator.

By Canon H. P. Liddon, D.D.

1. What is meant by Creation? Nothing less than the giving being to that which before was not. The Hebrew word used here does not preclude the idea of some pre-existing material ready to the hand of the Creator. But the text as a whole does preclude such an idea. For 'the heavens and the earth' includes all that is not God. Its form is taken from man's point of view; but the word 'heavens' includes not merely the material bodies which astronomy has in view, but also the immaterial essences that are older than man, and whose existence was gradually revealed to Israel. This is the Jewish interpretation and the interpretation of early Christianity.

2. Belief in the creation of the universe out of nothing is the only account of its origin that is compatible with belief in a personal and moral God. There are four ways of conceiving of the relation between God and the world.

(*a*) The world (that is, the thinking part of the world) is the creator of God. But a purely subjective Deity is no Deity at all.

(*b*) God and the world are identical. That is, there is a point in the self-development of the infinite when it reaches self-consciousness, and it is called God. But such a Deity is neither personal nor moral.

(*c*) God and the world, though distinct, are eternally coexistent. But it is of the very essence of Deity that He possess solitary self-existence. As Tertullian says, 'He who asserts the eternity of matter really asserts two Gods.'

(*d*) If, therefore, we are to believe in God's self-existent, personal, moral life, it is necessary to believe in the creation of the universe out of nothing. But this faith in God's original act of creation does not exclude belief in some subsequent modification of His works through a progressive development, guided by more or less ascertainable law. It is this belief also that gives us faith in God's Providence and in Redemption. God created the world in His freedom. Why? we accordingly ask. Revelation answers, Because He would communicate His life—that generous attribute which is goodness in relation to things, love in relation to persons.

II.

Beginning with God.

By the Rev. Mark Guy Pearse.

'In the beginning God.'—So all begins with God. Not from nature up to God am I to move, but from God down to nature. And so at the outset the Word demands my faith. And the record of the triumphs of faith in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews begins here: 'Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.' It is possible to get at God by reason, a logical First Cause, but not at our gracious and loving Father. I cannot kneel down to the First Cause and speak to Him.

'God created the heaven and the earth.' So then I am a God-made man in a God-made world. My soul, give thanks that the devil had no hand in the making of anything. Lift up thyself with nothing within thee, nothing about thee, but that which God can hallow and sanctify and use.

1. Think of the desolate earth hearing of some fair sister world, brilliantly shining, decked with beauty, while within herself through dreadful darkness waves sweep restlessly. What hope has she? Can she bid a sun to shine? Then God the Almighty bends over her. He speaks, and the dreary waste becomes a Paradise. So do we despair if we look within. All is dark, empty, desolate. We look away at the great lights above us. If we were only like such a one, we sigh, so good, so noble, so devoted! Then to us also God comes, the Almighty. He puts forth His gracious power within us and saves us.

2. Again, the earth appeals to its Creator. He

had created it; will He now leave it, cast it off forlorn, deserted? And God preserves the earth and works His will in it. So our soul, rescued from the chaos of evil, pleads with God to continue the good work He has begun. And he sees to it that all things work together for good to them that love Him; for whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate *to be conformed to the image of His Son.*

3. And the earth, rising out of chaos, dreams of Paradise, grassy slope and fruitful grove, with flowers scenting all the air and happy songs of birds. But it is so far off, and the throes and agonies that the earth suffers now are enough to blot the vision out. But upon the earth there dawns the dream of Paradise, when the fulness of the time has come. And so when the vision comes to the heart of man of that rest that remaineth, that city which hath foundations, the present evil heart of unbelief seems to blot it out, or make it merely a dream. But the man Christ Jesus comes from the Paradise of God, and returns not alone. Now we know not what we shall be, but we know that we shall be like Him: for we shall see Him as He is.

Illustrations.

Moses does not attempt to prove the existence of God. A proof that God existed was redundant—in Moses' time mankind admitted too many gods. Instead of beginning with nature, and climbing laboriously up on a ladder constructed by the cunning hands of logic to nature's God, the writer boldly begins at the other end—at the top, with God; and from this infinite height, with swift wing, descends to God's works. Instead of the creation demonstrating God, God explains the creation. The Being of God is a primary truth, and in Holy Writ is everywhere taken for granted. He holds the same place in the moral world that axioms do in mathematics—He is self-evident, fundamental, necessary, not supported by, but supporting, every other truth.

Moses writes no explanatory introduction, offers no humble apology. But having been on the mount with God, like an eagle he swoops down upon us majestically. From the loftiest altitude, from the sublimest verity, he comes down with transfigured countenance, dazzling his readers with the white light of eternal truth: 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' How much grander is that, and more impressive, than if he had carefully welded together small syllogisms to enable us painfully to reach the conclusion that there is a God. Moses' way is the Divine way. Only small, carping, peddling minds it is that demand a proof. If God condescends to demonstrate to us His existence, it will be, not by logic, but by revelation.—J. C. Jones.

There are men who look into this book, expecting it to teach them all the truth respecting God's creation; but they find that the records God has given in nature, drawn out and systematized in the science of geology, cannot cohere with the account of Moses. Upon this there have been two or three modes of evasion tried: first, that of those who refused to recognize at all what this science taught; secondly, that of those who, by spreading the six days of creation over an unlimited surface, and making them represent any space of time, would have compromised the matter; the third, and I believe the last, expedient is to allow a chasm between the first and second verses, between which time is given for all that geology requires. But we need not resort to methods such as these. There are two revelations: one God has written on the page of creation, to be ascertained by investigation, and it is just as inspired, just as true, just as much to be received as God's word as the handwriting on the wall at Babylon; the other revelation is written in the page of Scripture. The first belongs to physical phenomena, the second to the spiritual dealings of God with man. For instance, we are told that God created the firmament, and placed it between the waters above and the waters below. The account tells, in accordance with the knowledge of the time, what the firmament then seemed to men; it does not pretend to state what it actually is. It uses the language of the day; and if God had a revelation to make now, it would be given in the expression of the day; it would say 'the sun rises,' though that is not scientifically correct. But this inconsistency with physical truth does not invalidate the great broad spiritual truths which revelation is meant to teach. Does it alter or weaken the spiritual facts revealed in this account of creation: that God does all by degrees, that He is the moral governor of the world; the spiritual truth that the introduction of a sinful will produces immense gain in point of knowledge, and immense loss in point of purity; that the man who has done wrong feels naked and ashamed in the sight of God?—F. W. Robertson.

If you are yourself but a particle of a huge and unconscious universe—a particle which, like a flake of foam, or a drop of rain, or a gnat, or a beetle, lasts its brief space, and then yields up its substance to be moulded into some new creature; if there is no power that understands you and sympathizes with you, and makes provision for your instincts, your aspirations, your capabilities; if man is himself the highest intelligence, and if all things are the purposeless result of physical forces; if, in short, there is no God, no consciousness at the beginning as at the end of all things, then nothing can be more melancholy than our position.—Marcus Dods.

Athanasius Kircher, the celebrated German astronomer, had an acquaintance whom he much esteemed, but who was unfortunately infected by atheistical principles, and denied the very existence of a God. Kircher, sincerely desirous to rescue his friend from his mistaken and ruinous opinion, determined to try to convince him of his error upon his own principles of reasoning. He first procured a globe of the heavens, handsomely decorated, and of conspicuous size, and placed it in a situation in his study where it would be

immediately observed. He then called upon his friend with an invitation to visit him, which was readily responded to, and on his arrival he was shown into the study. It happened exactly as Kircher had planned. His friend no sooner observed it than he inquired whence it had come and to whom it belonged. 'Shall I tell you, my friend,' said Kircher, 'that it belongs to no one, that it was never made by anyone, but came here by mere chance?' 'That,' replied the atheist, 'is impossible; you jest.' This was Kircher's golden opportunity, and he promptly and wisely availed himself of it. 'You will not, with good reason, believe that this small globe originated in mere chance, and yet you will contend that those vast heavenly bodies, of which this is but a faint diminutive resemblance, came into existence without either order, design, or a creation!' His friend was first confounded, then convinced, and ultimately abandoning all his former scepticisms, he gladly united with all who reverence and love God in acknowledging the glory and adoring the majesty of the great Creator of the heavens and earth and all their host.—W. M. TAYLOR.

THERE is a remarkable sentence or two in the preface to John Wesley's first volume of sermons, in which that great evangelist gives us the secret of his method of Bible-study. 'Here am I,' he says, 'far from the busy ways of men. I sit down alone; only God is here. In His presence I open, I read His Book; for this end, to find the way to heaven. Does anything appear dark or intricate? I lift my heart to the Father of Lights. I then search after and consider parallel passages of Scripture, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. I meditate thereon with all the attention and earnestness of which my mind is capable. And what I thus learn, that I teach.' To Wesley, then, there were two great realities—the visible *Book*, and its invisible but ever-present *Author*; and to a man of his training and spiritual susceptibilities the one would have been a perfect enigma without the other. He saw *God* at the beginning of every section of Holy Scripture.—W. MIDDLETON.

Sermons for Reference.

Alford (H.), Quebec Chapel Sermons, iv. 1.
Bacon (L. W.), Simplicity that is in Christ, 196.
Brooke (Stopford A.), Sermons, i. 222.
Cumming (J.), Church before the Flood, 79.
Difficulties of the Bible, 503.
How (W. W.), Plain Words, ii. 59.
Hutchings (W. H.), Sermon Sketches, 54.
Kingsley (C.), Discipline, 112.
,, ,, Gospel of the Pentateuch, 1.
Leathes (S.), Truth and Life, 1.
Liddon (H. P.), Sermons from Penny Pulpit, i. 205.
,, ,, University Sermons, ii. 38.
Lockyer (T. F.), Inspirations of the Christian Life, 1.
Magee (W. C.), Sermons (Contemp. Pulp. Lib.), 26.
Meyer (F. B.), Calvary to Pentecost, 79.
Middleton (W.), Alpha and Omega, 15.
Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, ii. 320.
Parker (J.), People's Bible, i. 49, 118.
Pearse (M. G.), Aspects of Blessed Life, 17.
Robertson (F. W.), Notes on Genesis, 1.
Soden (J. J.), Sermons on Social Subjects, 1.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xi. No. 660.
Swing (D.), Sermons, 195.
Vaughan (J.), Sermons, xv. 37.

The Historical Background of the Epistle to the Philippians.

By the Rev. H. A. A. Kennedy, M.A., D.Sc., Callander.

CONSIDERABLE vagueness has prevailed as to the order in which 'Philippians' stands among the Epistles of the Captivity. Lightfoot and Hort have lent the weight of their authority to the opinion which would place it first in the series. Meyer, Weiss, Lipsius, Holtzmann, and others are equally decided in assigning to it the last place. We do not intend at present to examine the arguments on either side. We wish rather to discover as clearly as possible what the Epistle itself has to say of the circumstances in which it was written, of the historical background which lies behind it. We believe that the situation is to be gathered rather from a few casual hints than from any direct statement.

It is admitted on all hands that the undertone of the whole Epistle is joy, a hopeful joy, which is only now and then overshadowed by a more sober mood. Now this joy is by no means accidental. It comes persistently into view. Nothing is allowed to mar it. Is it not, then, Paul's deliberate intention to write to the Philippians in a cheerful tone, and must not this be done with the express purpose of correcting some erroneous impressions which they had formed? From the personal nature of the joy which he emphasizes, these

erroneous impressions probably related to himself. Indeed this is made almost certain by 1^{12}: τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ μᾶλλον εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν, 'My circumstances have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel.' μᾶλλον shows that their anticipations had been deceived. Not only had his affairs *not* turned out unfavourably, as they feared, but, on the contrary, to the advantage of the gospel and of him, its preacher.

What were the circumstances in Paul's experience which they dreaded? These can only be pieced together from informal references in the Epistle. In 1^{7} he tells them that he thinks of them as sharers with him in the grace of God: ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 'Both in my imprisonment and in the defence and confirmation of the gospel.' We believe that here he is speaking, not metaphorically, but with definite facts before his mind. He is a prisoner. But he has been in that condition for long. There has been a further development of the situation. The protracted delay in the hearing of his case (Ac 28^{30}: ἐνέμεινεν . . . διετίαν ὅλην ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι, 'He abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling,' R.V.) has come to an end. His ἀπολογία has begun. Of course this ἀπολογία is at the same time a defence of the gospel. Nay. His appearance in the Roman court of justice is something more. It is a βεβαίωσις of the gospel. βεβ. was a technical legal term, equivalent to the Latin *auctoritas* or *evictio* (see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 100 ff.). It signified the guarantee which the seller in a transaction gave to the purchaser against any claims that might be laid to the object purchased. Paul's presence before the Roman magistrates is a guarantee for the gospel.

Now we begin to see some light on the Philippians' anxiety. So long as Paul lived in his own lodging, although a prisoner technically, he was, to all intents and purposes, a free man. But now the final issue has come. The necessary documents have been handed in from the lower court. Probably this process has caused the delay.[1] Everything will henceforth turn on the decision of the higher tribunal. Paul is now a prisoner in reality, perhaps removed to one of the gloomy State-prisons as soon as a time has been fixed for the hearing of his case. No wonder the hearts of his loyal Philippian converts are filled with dark forebodings.

How, then, in so critical a situation, can the apostle write with such exuberant joy, what reason has he for such high spirits? No doubt he has learnt, as he tells the Philippians (4^{11}), to be content in any circumstances. But plainly, from 1^{12}, his affairs have taken a favourable turn. Will not this be closely connected with the hearing of his case? Must it not be that his judges are already discovering that the accusation brought against him is a sham: that he is not a leader of sedition, dangerous to society, but simply a religious enthusiast who has done nothing worthy of death or of bonds? He is recognized, he says, to be a prisoner for Christ's sake (1^{13}: τοὺς δεσμούς μου φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι: 'My bonds have become manifest in Christ'). This recognition takes place ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ. These words are usually taken to mean either 'among the whole prætorian guard' (so, *e.g.* Lightfoot, Hofmann, Haupt), or 'throughout the barracks of the guard' (so, *e.g.* Alford, Lipsius, Klöpper, von Soden). And good arguments can be used to support these interpretations, more especially the first mentioned. But a new and most suggestive explanation has been proposed by Professor Mommsen, the greatest living authority on Roman history. In the Sitz.-Berichte of the Berlin Academy, 30th May 1895 (p. 498 ff.), he observes that by this time the emperor's delegates for hearing such appeals as that of Paul were the *præfecti prætorio*. Accordingly he takes the words before us to mean the judicial authorities as a whole, the *præfecti prætorio*, with their numerous assistants and subordinates. The sympathy which Paul found in these official circles is corroborated, he believes, by the greetings sent (4^{22}) from those ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας. This striking explanation, it may be said, has been warmly advocated by Professor W. M. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 357).

One cannot help feeling that these various facts, grouped together, shed a clear light on the whole situation. Paul may well feel hopeful, for already his Christian brethren have become emboldened by the turn which affairs have taken (1^{14}). We need not wonder that in 1^{19} he declares his conviction that his present situation μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν, 'Will result in my deliverance.' This is the meaning assigned to σωτ. by the great Greek

[1] See Geib, *Geschichte des röm. Criminal-processes*, p. 689 ff.

expositors, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret. The words are a quotation from Job 13^{16} (LXX). There it is a judicial process that is in view, and the word means victory in the struggle for right. His contest has begun. He hopes that in nothing will he be put to shame (1^{20}, *αἰσχυνθήσομαι*—probably by denying Christ or failing to set forth His claims in the best light), but that at this very time (*καὶ νῦν*, his trial) Christ may be glorified in his person, whether by life or death (for, of course, he cannot be certain of release. Despotic tribunals were notoriously arbitrary). Still he feels justified in believing that a happy prospect awaits him in this life. It is not going beyond probability to speak (1^{26}) of his *παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς* ('presence again with you'), or to express his confidence (2^{24}) that he will soon visit them.

There is every reason to believe that Paul's expectation was realized (see Harnack, *Chronologie*, pp. 238–239). If the foregoing brief discussion have any validity, we can the more easily picture the actual facts on which that expectation was based; we are able more clearly to grasp the historical background of the whole situation. Plainly, this favours the hypothesis that 'Philippians' is the latest of the Imprisonment-Epistles.[1]

[1] After arriving at the above conclusions, we have been gratified to find that the same general view of the situation, supported by many of the same arguments, has been taken by Zahn, *Einleitung in d. N.T.*, Bd. i. pp. 380–382, 391–392. He rejects, however, Mommsen's explanation of *πραιτώριον*.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Sennacherib and Sargon.

Dr. Lehmann's handsomely printed book,[1] though addressed to the specialist in Assyro-Babylonian history, ought to interest Old Testament scholars as well. The two problems which he sets himself to solve are: (1) the apparent discrepancy between the date given by Sennacherib, at Bavian, for the reign of Tiglath-pileser I. and other chronological records that have come to us; and (2) the vast antiquity assigned by Nabonidos to Sargon of Akkad and his son Naram-Sin. His book deals very exhaustively with these two questions, and brings together all the materials for settling them which were known up to the date of its publication. Among them the so-called Dynastic Tablet naturally occupies a prominent place. This is a tablet discovered by Mr. Pinches, which, though unfortunately mutilated, gives us the names of the Babylonian kings from the 'First Dynasty of Babylon' onward, arranged in dynasties, and with the length of each reign attached. Had the tablet been complete we should have had an exact chronology—at all events, as it was conceived by the native historians—from the foundation of the dynasty to which Khammurabi or Amraphel belonged.

[1] *Zwei Hauptprobleme der altorientalischen Chronologie und ihre Lösung.* By C. F. Lehmann. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1898.

The tablet is badly written, and, consequently, difficult of decipherment, even where it has not been injured or destroyed. Dr. Lehmann has made a careful examination of the numerical ciphers contained in it, and has thus been able to correct some of those given in the published copies of the text. In certain cases, however, the actual cipher must remain doubtful until a duplicate of the inscription can be found. But there is one point of chronological importance which may be considered as settled; the fourth dynasty (of Isin) lasted 132 years, and not 62 years as was at first supposed.

But before problems can be solved they must first exist; and that Dr. Lehmann's problems have any real existence seems to me more than questionable. Frankly, I do not believe in them, in spite of all the learning and historical acumen displayed in his book. Let us first take his second problem, that of the antiquity of the date (3800 B.C.) assigned to Sargon of Akkad.

Dr. Lehmann's difficulty here does not lie in the remoteness of the date, but in the fact that between the era of Sargon and that of the second dynasty of Ur, a period of a thousand years according to Nabonidos, no dated Babylonian monuments have been discovered. Hence Dr. Lehmann concludes that the interval in question had no existence. But it is dangerous to argue from the imperfection of our knowledge, more

especially in matters relating to Babylonia, where as yet only two sites have been explored with any approach to scientific completeness. The Egyptologist is familiar with the fact that while monumental remains are abundant in one period of history, they are entirely wanting in another; in spite of the care with which Egypt has been ransacked, there is still a monumental gap between the sixth and eleventh dynasties, and again between the thirteenth and the seventeenth. We have a striking example of the same fact in Babylonian history itself. The Dynastic Tablet tells us that the first dynasty of Babylon was followed by a dynasty of eleven kings, who ruled for 368 years. And yet *not a single monumental trace of any of these kings has thus far been found.* Upon Dr. Lehmann's principles the dynasty and the period of time during which it lasted ought alike to be non-existent. As a matter of fact our monumental knowledge of Babylonian history is still practically confined to three epochs,—that of Sargon of Akkad, that of Khammurabi, and that of Nebuchadnezzar II. and his successors. Even for the period which preceded the Assyrian conquest of Babylonia we have but little monumental evidence, and most of that comes from Assyrian sources. Room, moreover, must be found for the multitudinous kings whose names are given in 'unchronological order' in a tablet, the object of which is to explain the meaning of them in Semitic Babylonian, and it is only natural to suppose that some at least of these names belong to the unknown period between the successor of Naram-Sin and the founder of the second dynasty of Ur. So far as I can see, therefore, there is no need to change the date assigned by Nabonidos to Sargon of Akkad, or to imagine that a king of antiquarian tastes, who had at his disposition far more historical and chronological materials than we possess, was mistaken in his calculations.

Dr. Lehmann has much more to say on behalf of the reality of his first problem. The fragmentary chronological notices that we have of the 'Kassite' period of Babylonian history certainly seem to conflict with one another, and to me at least appear to present an insoluble puzzle. Here again we must wait for more light. But I cannot agree with Dr. Lehmann in thinking that the puzzle would be solved by correcting 'the Bavian date.' His chief argument against the latter its is supposed inconsistency with the Dynastic Tablet. The mutilated condition of the tablet, however, must not be forgotten, nor is the chronology of the tablet itself altogether beyond suspicion. In 1890, in the preface to the 3rd volume of the new series of *Records of the Past*, p. xv, I gave reasons for questioning the accuracy of the compiler of it in the case of the first dynasty of Babylon, and since then Dr. Meissner has discovered the name of a king, Immerum, who is shown by the contracts to have reigned over Babylonia at that very time, and whose name is, nevertheless, omitted in the compiler's list. And since the publication of Dr. Lehmann's book, a text which has just been published by the Trustees of the British Museum throws further doubt on the compiler's accuracy. The text consists of chronological tables which were drawn up in the reign of Ammi-zadok, the fourth successor of Khammurabi, and the number of regnal years assigned by it to the kings of the dynasty differs materially in several instances from that given by the Dynastic Tablet. Sumu-abi, the founder of the dynasty, is made to reign 14 years instead of 15; his successor, Sumu-la-ilu, 36 years instead of 35; Sin-muballidh, the father of Khammurabi, 20 years instead of 30; Khammurabi himself, 43 years instead of 55; and his son, Samsu-iluna, 38 years instead of 35. Some of these differences may be explained by the supposition that the compiler of the Dynastic Tablet included in the reigns of the legitimate kings, the reigns of princes like Pungun-ilu, Immerum, and Eri-Aku, whom he considered illegitimate; he has certainly done this in the case of the Kassite dynasty, where the seven years' rule of the Assyrian conqueror, Tiglath-Bir, at Babylon, is omitted altogether.

But, even apart from the question of the confidence to be placed in the chronological exactitude of the Dynastic Tablet, there is no ground for believing it to be inconsistent with the statement of the Bavian inscription that Merodach-nadin-akhi, the Babylonian opponent of Tiglath-pileser I., reigned about 1100 B.C. On the contrary, the Dynastic Tablet itself, when correctly read, necessitates the 'Bavian chronology.' Mr. Pinches has pointed out to me that the name of the 26th Kassite king, which has been misread Gisammeti, is really Kudhur-[Bel], whose son, Sagarakti-buryas, lived 800 years before Nabonidos. As Kudhur-Bel is placed by Dr. Lehmann in 1330 B.C., the end of the Kassite dynasty will fall in

1233 B.C. instead of 1113 B.C. as he supposes, and all disagreement between the Bavian date and the Dynastic Tablet vanishes at once. The first 'problem' thus shares the fate of the second, and is really non-existent.

But though the two points upon which Dr. Lehmann's book turns are somewhat of the nature of a will-o'-the-wisp, the book itself is a valuable contribution to ancient Babylonian history. All the historical materials at present at our disposal are given in it with a completeness and lucidity which leave nothing to be desired, and the elaborate chronological tables attached to the volume—whatever opinion we may hold of the system of chronology they embody—will be found quite indispensable by the students of early chronology, whether Babylonian, Assyrian, or Biblical. The minute examination, moreover, to which the numerical ciphers of the Dynastic Tablet have been subjected, is a guarantee that in that particular direction no fresh light is to be expected. In his interpretation of one of the numerical summaries, however, Dr. Lehmann, like the other German and French Assyriologists who have discussed the question, involves himself in needless difficulties. The literal translation of the summary at the end of the Nabonassar dynasty is neither 22 (or 31) kings, nor 22 years, but '22 dynasties.' With the epoch of Nabonassar a new chronological era began; the supremacy of Babylon passed away, and the Babylonian throne came to be filled by Assyrian conquerors. The compiler of the tablet, accordingly, pauses to note that up to that point twenty-two dynasties had ruled since the beginning of Babylonian history.

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

Budde's Commentary on 'Lamentations.'[1]

THERE is a peculiar fitness in the circumstance that the illustrious investigator of the laws of the *kînah* measure—Professor K. Budde—has been chosen as commentator on the *Klagelieder* in Mohr's *Kurzer Handcommentar*. All Old Testament scholars are aware that in spite of the prior labours of de Wette, Keil, and Ewald, the Hebrew elegiac measure was practically discovered by Budde and made known to the world in his famous article in the *ZATW* (1882, pp. 1–52). What the same scholar is capable of as a commentator has been shown by his work on *Judges* in the same series as the present, and on *Job* in the *Handcommentar* of Nowack.

The short Book of Lamentations, it is safe to say, is one of the least known in the Old Testament to the average reader of the English Bible. For this the obscurity of language (we mean in the Authorized Version) and a supposed monotony of tone have been hitherto partly responsible. Yet we venture to assert that it is a book which deserves the closest study, alike for the intrinsic value of its contents and for the glimpse it gives us into Jewish modes of thought and aspirations at various periods of the post-exilic history. At *various* periods, we say, for, as we shall find presently, the little book cannot be regarded as a unity.

In our English Bibles, as in the Septuagint, Lamentations follows immediately after Jeremiah. This position was doubtless originally due to the notion that the latter prophet was its author. Nay, in the LXX the two books are connected by the sentence which introduces Lamentations, 'And it came to pass after Israel was led into captivity and Jerusalem laid waste, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said.' Until comparatively recently the prevailing tradition in Jewish and (consequently) in Christian circles was to a similar effect. But the tendency is now all the other way, and we should have been exceedingly surprised if Budde had shown himself conservative here (for conservative he can be, as his work on *Job* shows). It may indeed be taken as a final result of criticism that Jeremiah did not write the book or any part of it. Scarcely anyone will be found to maintain the prophet's authorship of the whole, and very few recent critics assign any part of it to him. Budde has an interesting discussion of the passage 2 Ch 35^{25}, 'And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah: and all the singing men and singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations unto this day, and they made them an ordinance in Israel: *and, behold, they are written in the lamentations.*' He agrees with W. R. Smith and others (against Thenius)

[1] *Die fünf Megillot.* Erklärt von Budde, Bertholet, Wildeboer. Edinburgh and London: Williams & Norgate. Price 4s.

that these last words refer to the canonical Book of Lamentations, in spite of the strange allusion to Josiah (which, however, is easily explicable, as coming from a writer like the Chronicler). But what is of most importance, Budde points out that this early tradition did not attribute all five poems to Jeremiah, but apparently only one of them, the other four being assigned to the 'singing men and singing women.' Jeremiah being out of the question, how many hands are we to recognize in the book? Chaps. 2 and 4 are generally regarded as the oldest and fundamental part of the whole, and while Budde does not agree with Thenius that they are actually Jeremiah's, he sees no reason for denying that the two proceed from one pen, the pen of an actual eye-witness of the scenes described. Formerly he was willing to assign chaps. 1 and 5 to this same hand, holding that chap. 3 alone was from a different and later hand than the rest of the book. But in the commentary before us he agrees with Löhr that chap. 1 (which is influenced by Deutero-Isaiah, *e.g.* in vv.$^{9f.}$) is post-exilic, perhaps *c.* 430 B.C., or more probably later. In regard to chap. 5 he is inclined to trace its source to the remnant that was left behind in Palestine, *c.* 550 B.C. Chap. 3 has always been felt to belong to a different category from the rest of the book. Budde would bring it down to the pre-Maccabæan section of the Greek period, the same as that to which Cheyne (*Origin of the Psalter*) assigns Ps 119.

Regarding the singular 'I' of chap. 3, Budde contends (against Cheyne, Smend, etc.) for the individual sense, instead of understanding it of the nation collectively, after the manner of many of the late Psalms. He supposes the 'I' to be intended by the author of the poem to personate an eye-witness (probably Jeremiah) of the destruction of Jerusalem.

As to the peculiarity of the acrostic arrangement, namely, that in chap. 1, it follows the usual order of the Hebrew alphabet, whereas in chaps. 2–4 (chap. 5 is not acrostic) the letter ב precedes ע ('as if with us P stood before O,'—Nöldeke), Budde wisely, we think, remarks, 'There is no explanation of this deviation.'

The commentary is remarkably full, considering the limited space, and very informing, while the textual criticism is, as we always expect from Budde, brilliant and frequently convincing. The whole work is worthy of its author, and constitutes a valuable addition to the series to which it belongs.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

The 'Western' Text of the New Testament.

THE publication of the readings of Codex Bezæ in Dr. Nestle's critical edition of the Greek Testament is one of many signs of reawakened interest in the vexed question of the relation of the text represented by this MS. to the text of the oldest Greek uncials. Professor Bousset, the editor of the *Theologische Rundschau*, does not hesitate to say that this is *the* problem of the science of the textual criticism of the New Testament, and in his own article on 'The Text of the New Testament,' which appears in the July number, there is an instructive survey of the history of the discussion, which is of especial value on account of its acute and suggestive criticisms of the theory advocated by Dr. Blass.

At the outset of his inquiry Blass limited his investigations to the Acts, his conclusion being that Luke is himself the author of two editions of this book. The R. text is the rough draft which Luke wrote at Rome, the A. text is Luke's revision of his earlier work; the R. text remained in possession of the church at Rome, the A. text in its original form was the copy sent to Theophilus. In his commentary Blass directs attention to a number of statements found in the R. text which, in his judgment, a later copyist could not have added, but which Luke alone would have ventured to omit as non-essential; hence he argues that the only theory which accounts for all the variations is that which ascribes both the improvements in style and the abbreviations of the A. text to Luke himself.

Bousset is of opinion that the strictures of Corssen and Bernhard Weiss have rendered the theory of Blass quite untenable. Corssen has endeavoured to prove that the language of the R. text often lacks the characteristics of Luke's style, whilst in many places it clearly bears the marks of a later recension. Bernhard Weiss, in undermining the foundations of the hypothesis of Blass, goes further in his depreciation of the R. text than

Bousset approves, for 'he very seldom reckons with the possibility that in the R. text an original reading may be found, and he very often makes use of violent methods in tracing the origin of the R. text to the A. text.'

As examples of passages in which the R. text shows evidences of later intentional revision, Bousset cites Ac $15^{32\text{-}40}$ $18^{4\text{-}7}$. According to the A. text of 15^{33} Judas *and Silas* 'were dismissed in peace' from Antioch, and yet in v.^{40} Paul is said to have chosen Silas as his companion, when he left Antioch on his missionary journey. The R. text inserts after v.^{33}: 'But it seemed good unto Silas to abide there, but Judas went forth alone.' The hypothesis of Blass requires us to believe that Luke, having written these words, omitted them from his revision, and so made an awkward gap in his narrative; Bousset contends that they are the intentional correction of an editor who was anxious to obliterate a supposed discrepancy in Luke's history. In 18^{7} the R. text reads: 'And (Paul) departed *from Aquila*,' the last two words being obviously intended to remove the ambiguity of the A. text: 'He departed *thence*.' But in this instance the corrector has not carefully read the context; the reference is not to a change in the private residence of Paul, but to his departure from the synagogue (18^{4}) to a new place of teaching. This reading is arbitrarily excluded by Blass from his reconstruction of the R. text, hence the statement that 'Corssen is right in describing this procedure as a *petitio principii*.'

On the whole question Bousset contends that the critical study of the two texts of the Acts does not yield results favourable to the theory of Blass, who is nevertheless right in maintaining that it is often impossible to assign any reason why a later editor should have introduced some of the variants which are found in the R. text. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that Bernhard Weiss has overshot the mark in his endeavour to show that in every instance the motive which led to the correction or addition may be discerned. Some place—Bousset rightly urges—must be left for the play of the editor's fancy and for accidental variations; more careful study may explain changes, the reason for which does not lie upon the surface; the possibility that in the R. text an original reading may sometimes be found must not be excluded; but the peculiarities of the R. text of the Acts are not likely to be accounted for except as the work of an editor who was not the author, but who intentionally revised the original text soon after its publication.

In his later works Blass has extended his investigations to the two texts of the Third Gospel, his conclusion being that whereas in the Acts the R. text preceded the shorter and more elegantly written A. text, in the Gospel the relation of the one text to the other is completely reversed. In the Acts the R. text is characterized by additions to the narrative and by greater detail in the descriptions; in the Gospel the R. text is more concise and pregnant. The explanation which Blass gives of these seemingly contradictory phenomena is ingenious;—he holds that whilst Luke wrote the first draft of the Acts in Rome, he wrote the first draft of the Gospel in Jerusalem, and revised it in Rome. Hence the R. text (*forma Romana*) is in the Acts the rough draft, but in the Gospel the revised edition.

Bousset fully recognizes the splendid service which Blass has rendered to the science of New Testament criticism by his reconstruction of the R. text of the Acts; but he argues with considerable force that the more recent attempt to reconstruct the R. text of the Third Gospel is not equally successful, and must be called premature. The authorities used by Blass are Codex Bezæ, with *e* and *k*, two African codices of the Old Latin version, but as witnesses to the R. text of the Gospel the oldest Syriac version and other MSS of the Old Latin version are available; it is therefore doubtful whether the reconstruction gives us the R. text or one of its descendants. For these and other reasons Bousset concludes that whilst the R. text of the Gospel contains more original readings than the R. text of the Acts, it is nevertheless a revision by another hand of the Gospel which Luke wrote.

J. G. Tasker.

Handsworth College.

The Inspiration of the Church.

By the Hon. and Rev. W. E. Bowen, M.A., Curate of St. Botolph, Aldgate, London.

'Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth.'—John xvi. 13 (R.V.).

These words are prophetic of the greatest and most blessed of all the Divine gifts to mankind. Never before in the long history of the human race had God given Himself as now—through the lips of His only begotten Son—He promises to give Himself. Never had He communicated Himself with the same measure of communication that Jesus Christ here speaks of. Men had never been without God, without the help of His inspiration, without the comfort of His over-arching love, but the coming in Person of the Holy Ghost—the third Member of the sacred Trinity, one with the Father and the Son—marked a new beginning, the commencement of a new era—nay, a new creation. A modern preacher[1] has spoken of each succeeding Pentecost as 'the commemoration of the birthday of the new birth of humanity itself,' and it is no more than the bare truth. That gift is really the dividing line between ancient and modern history—if, that is, we regard history as something more than a record of political events, of rising and falling dynasties, of wars and treaties, of varying geographical boundaries, of legal enactments, if we regard it—as what surely it really is—the story of the human race as a whole, of all that makes up mankind, of all the struggles, whether national or social or moral or spiritual, from which our modern complex life has gradually emerged. What variation or shift or crisis can equal, for the Christian man or woman, that stupendous change which was brought about by that measure of self-communication of which Whitsuntide speaks to us, and which Jesus Christ in these words, on the last evening of His earthly life, foretells to His perplexed disciples? His own ministry amongst them was about to terminate. They should see Him again—after all the worst that human error and malice could do had been wreaked upon Him—but not for long. He must 'go away,' and it was 'expedient' for *them* that He should do so. But the issues of that ministry should be fostered and cherished and brought to perfection by the Comforter or Advocate whom He would send, and in whom His Church should have for ever an abiding guide and an unfailing helper. He who had given Himself, in His Son, should now give Himself in His Holy Spirit.

And what does such a gift in fact carry with it but the gift of a special measure of inspiration? Believe in the one and you must believe in the other. If once you say that the Holy Spirit is with the Church you must go on to say that the Christian Church is an inspired body, and inspired as not even the Jewish Church was. If once you admit that God has not withdrawn, and will not withdraw, this new and wondrous bestowal of Himself, then you must go on to admit, not only the special, but also the continuous inspiration of the Church.

It is, of course, more than what it is sometimes made, the inspiration of one particular order. The original promise was, indeed, to the Twelve, but the fulfilment was for all. The great spiritual prerogatives of the Christian society are the inheritance of the entire body; their exercise may be limited to the few, but the limitation is through the act of the Church herself, not through any separation, by the Head of the Church, of one part of the body from another. The great acts of the Christian ministry derive their validity from the entire society, upon which, in its unbroken solidarity, the power was originally bestowed by Him who alone could give it. It is the body corporate which absolves,—'Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.' It is the body corporate which consecrates,—'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ?' So, too, it is within the body corporate that there dwells, and for ever, the privilege of inspiration. 'Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth.'

The privilege of inspiration! The gift of the Holy Spirit! Guidance into all the truth! It is a tremendous promise, and the claim that as the centuries pass, as generation follows generation, it is being slowly fulfilled is a tremendous claim. But it is a claim which we *must* make. We are

[1] Dean Church, *Cathedral and University Sermons*, p. 170.

surely false to our calling, if we allow any doubt of our own, or any current of contemporary prejudice, or any measure of opposition, whether from without or within, to come between us and the full assertion of those gifts and prerogatives of which He Himself spoke to us, of which He Himself is the source and fountain. How can we say, how *dare* we say, that there is no inspiration, when He Himself promised us that there should be? How dare we pretend that it was limited to a few years, when He Himself promised us His own perpetual presence? How dare we say, either to ourselves or to one another, that the Church is alone, solitary in the midst of 'a naughty world' till He return, when we have His own assurance of 'a Comforter, who shall be with us for ever, even the Spirit of Truth'?

And yet any claim to inspiration seems to well-nigh 'stick in our throats.' It looks, in the face of so much of the past, a claim not only presumptuous but outrageous. There is so much of Church history which seems to rise up and give the lie direct to any such hope. It is an old thought that the Church herself has been the condemnation of her own doctrines. It is an old taunt that upon almost every page of her annals there lies written the contradiction of her pretensions. It is an old question whether past and present do not combine to make manifest the impossibility and absurdity of any interpretation of the Church of Christ as 'the Church of the Living God,' as anything beyond a strictly human association, with a multitude of crimes upon its head in bygone days, with, if not crimes, at any-rate follies, to degrade it as it exists among us now. Blundering, quarrelling, schism, cruelty, oppression, have not they—we are asked again and again, asked with all the eloquence of indignation, with all the force of bitter reproach—been the ingredients of much of the medicine with which the Christian Church has sought at times—when she might have known better, when she *ought* to have known better—to heal the sorrows and miseries and ignorances of mankind? Are these the resources of the inspired physician or of the degraded quack? Have the scientific mistakes of the Church been inspired? Have the doctrinal exaggerations and excesses of the Church been inspired? Have her political failures been inspired? Is the history of the dark ages, on its spiritual side, the history of an inspired community? But let us not go on with the well-known indictment. Let us admit that if the brighter spots have sometimes been forgotten and lost sight of, there have, none the less, been large tracts of deep blackness, been mistakes made and wrongs done, such as the world will never let us forget, been failures of duty, lapses from the true standard, nay, epochs of prolonged degradation, such as our own consciences will never let us forgive. It has been very justly said that 'we expect to be disappointed in the world: but to be disappointed in what has come to save and heal the world, this is bitterness indeed.' And there *is* this depth of disappointment: there *is* this extremity of bitterness. There *is* this much-checkered past.

Yes; there is this past with all its errors and shortcomings, with all its follies and guilt; but behind the past there is the promise of the Lord Himself; and in spite of the past, the virtue and blessing of that promise continue even for ever. 'The gifts and calling of God are without repentance.' And does it not help us to realize what the true meaning of the inspiration of the Church is, what that inspiration is on its intellectual side, when we look at it, not in the sphere of doctrine, but in the simpler sphere of plain morals? For that most priceless gift of Himself to the world was not made by God only to guide men into all truth, but also to lead them into all righteousness. 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.' There was the ideal: and the gift came that men might be able to slowly struggle towards it. It had been out of the reach of the world as it was 'in Adam.' It was not to be out of the reach of the world as it should be 'in Christ.' It was not to be out of the reach of mankind, if only they would open heart and soul and conscience to that new guest who came to be both their Consoler and Inspirer, to be their Guide and their Mainstay, 'to convince them of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.' There had been the ever-increasing dominion of evil, a dominion ending in a collapse such as the world has never seen since, such as those who beheld it thought beyond hope and remedy; there was to be the infusion of a new spiritual and moral energy, through which the lost ground was slowly to be regained, and the consequences of what had been an ever-spreading disaster gradually undone. There was to be this *moral* inspiration. And yet it too was to be checked and thwarted and made of none effect.

It, too, like the inspiration towards truth, was to seem, at times, to work in vain, to be a force overmastered and overwhelmed by the forces which opposed it, a power too weak to contend against the hellish agencies which manifested themselves in human cruelty and selfishness and lust. More than once it has seemed as though the ship of the Church must perish, not from any storm which broke upon her from outside, not from external hostility and persecution, but because of the fatal weight of her own sins and vices, because of the iniquity of her rulers, because of the depravity and corruption of her own members. Yes, it seemed so. But it was not to be so. Always there was a latent power of recovery; always there was a renovating principle, of which men could avail themselves, if only they would; always there was the presence of this gift; always there was the grace of the Risen and Ascended Christ; always there was this eternal indwelling of the Holy Ghost. And of the value of that gift, of the meaning of that indwelling—so far as our moral life goes—we see the real measure as we look back to the empire of the Cæsars, and put our own times against those. We see what the moral work of the Spirit has been, as we think how new, and once well-nigh unknown, virtues have made their way into the code of society and taken a high place there; how different is the estimate which is now placed upon love and mercy and pity and forgiveness, upon the value of each individual life, upon patience and longsuffering, upon chastity and sobriety, to that which prevailed in Imperial Rome; how complete is the change which has come over the world's thoughts about disease and poverty and self-sacrifice, about all those duties which we sum up in the old phrase, '*noblesse oblige*.' It requires a serious effort of the mind to set the days of Tiberius against the close of this nineteenth century, and to compare the two. Quite apart from the growth of science, or the development of literature, quite apart from forms of government or any of the externals of society, there is this tremendous, this overpowering contrast between the moral stature of the one age and the moral stature of the other, between the level of goodness then and the level of goodness now, between the spiritual attainments of the later Roman world and the spiritual attainments of the Christendom of to-day. In that contrast we see, I say, the measure of the work of the Spirit. It is not less true of our social than of our individual life that

> Every virtue we possess,
> And every conquest won,
> And every thought of holiness,
> Are His alone.

Yes; in all that greater care for the poor, in all that wider sympathy for suffering, in all that deeper horror of bloodshed, in all that greater purity of life, in all that profounder sense of sin, in all that truer love of simple unaffected goodness, in all that is implied by the extinction of the gladiatorial games, by the abolition of slavery, by the suppression of infanticide, by the raising of hospitals and refuges, by the sanctity and beauty of home life—in all that, and more than all that, in far more than many words could express, have we the evidence of what the gift of the Spirit has meant for the world, the earnest of the moral inspiration with which Jesus Christ, before His ascension, endowed His Church.

And if, with these thoughts on our minds, we turn back to the question with which we set out—the question, not of the moral, but of the doctrinal inspiration of the Church, we see (do we not?) what the answer is to those old objections of which we said something, what the mistaken conception is that lies at their basis. We misunderstood the nature of inspiration. We thought that God would force truth upon us, that He would compel us to see and recognize it, that He would make error impossible, that He would make truth manifest. We thought that the treasure would be ours, not in earthen vessels, but apart from all human insufficiency. So we thought, and because things have not been as we expected, because God's ways have proved different to our own, we are tempted into denial and faithlessness. But directly we look at the moral history of the Church, we see what inspiration means, and what its divinely appointed limits are. It means that God helps human weakness, but that He does not override human wilfulness. It means a power with us 'making for righteousness' and truth, but a power against which we can successfully rebel, which we can thwart and annul, which we can refuse to avail ourselves of. To get the fulness of inspiration, there must not only be the perfect co-operation of God with man, but the perfect co-operation of man with God. There is, indeed, the Spirit, but there is, alas! also resistance to the

Spirit. There are the effects of human prejudice and haste, of our unteachableness, of our bigotry; there is the fruit of our own mental and spiritual insolence ever rising up to contest the ground with the fruit of God's greatest gift to man. Inspiration, as it touches doctrine, is no nearer omnipotence than when it touches morals.

And when once we realize this, we realize how fallacious is not a little of the popular reasoning of the day. Take, for example, that familiar remark, 'If I believed in an inspired Church, I should go over to Rome.' In other words, my friend, you will go over to a Church whose claim to plenary inspiration is at best a claim of a most one-sided character. The *moral* inspiration of that communion, as the Roman Catholic must needs admit, runs in no fuller stream than it does elsewhere. Why, then, should Rome possess *doctrinal* inspiration in its perfection? Why should the Spirit of God have worked on one side with completeness but on the other have been checked and limited and restrained? You must show me absolute moral inspiration before you can ask me to believe in absolute doctrinal inspiration. You must show me the kingdom of heaven in all its sanctity before you bid me do homage to its infinite wisdom. If I may use the expression, inspiration is inspiration all round. As I find it in one sphere, so I shall expect to find it in the other. I find it imperfect as a moral force; I shall not look for it to be perfect as an intellectual influence. I find it conditional in matters of conduct; I shall not therefore demand of it that it be unconditional in matters of belief. In each case, in the second not less than the first, I shall expect the infusion of the human element—of the element which will, to a greater or less degree, injure and mar the beauty of the whole—but which is there because God in His infinity and His wisdom wills it so, because men are exalted to be more than the unconscious instruments upon which the hand of God plays, because it is their calling and their duty, and their high privilege, to be His 'fellow-workers' both now and hereafter, in this world as in the next.

Or take again some of the popular discussions over the Church's Creeds. I go to one man and ask him his opinion of them, and he answers me, 'They are the infallible voice of the Church. To deny them is to deny the Spirit who inspired them.' I go to another and he tells me that they are merely human compositions, lacking any intrinsic authority, man-made from first to last. How shall we decide between the two? Are we to regard the Nicene Creed as merely the outcome of theological subtlety and skill? or are we to ascribe to the Holy Ghost the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed? Do we not see that the truth lies between the two alternatives? The creeds are not purely human; nor are they purely Divine. They are in part both. They are the issues of the Divine working upon the human. There is inspiration there; but there is the absence of inspiration as well. The door is not fully opened to the Spirit. But it is none the less true that there is more than human agency there. We do, indeed, see those Creeds made by the men of those times. We hear the work beaten out in fierce, perhaps wild and turbulent, discussion. We hear the clink of the hammer, we listen to the shouts of the workmen; but we do not know, we do not see, or hear and see only in some portion of the result, the spiritual visitant who came into the world when Jesus Christ was withdrawn in the flesh from it, that mankind might never again be without the presence of that God who had vouchsafed to enter into it.

And is it not in this way that we explain what is so striking a feature in the Christian Faith, its power of assimilating itself to the advancing knowledge of the human race? Each discovery, instead of drawing the veil farther over the face of the gospel, only illumines it with new brilliancy. Even Darwinism has added to our realization of its fulness. And to-day, though more than eighteen centuries have passed since the foundation of the Christian Church was laid, that Church is still with us, the greatest of all influences, the most potent of all forces. It is broken into fragments; it is at war with itself; we look in vain for unanimity; sometimes we look in vain even for brotherly love; but there this Church is with its great Catholic, or Anglican, or Presbyterian, or Nonconformist branches, speaking to the world of what are, in the main, the old doctrines, but to which men still listen with reverence; preaching the old gospel to which men of intellect still submit themselves; offering a revelation which the scholar and the philosopher, no less than the woman and the child, are thankful to behold. If there is one thing more certain than another it is that Christianity has *not* had its day. And to

what is this permanence due? What lies at the root of this strange stability? What has given this adaptibility, this unending sufficiency of development? How is it that the great Christian dogmas are still able to crown every advance of science, still able to complete every guess of the best speculation, still able to meet and satisfy the needs both of brain and conscience? To what shall we attribute it all? To what but to that gift which at times we are so apt to deny, to that most wondrous self-bestowal which is so often forgotten or ignored?

'When He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He shall guide you into all the truth.' The promise is for us, even for us. We have our perplexities—God knows their weight. We have our burdens—they are indeed heavy. But we have also this most glorious heritage. Let us not be false to it. Let us not be unworthy of it. But how can we think that we are true to it, if, under the pressure of difficulty, or in the turmoil of dispute, we are rancorous and self-willed, easily excited, quickly roused to passion; if we are uncharitable and intolerant; if we think highly of ourselves and meanly of others; if we are petty or pharasaical; if we exaggerate details; if we are so ready to shut the kingdom of heaven against men? Do let us remember what is required of us, if the grace of the Spirit of God is to work efficiently in and through us. Have we not to be tractable and kindly and modest, to be spiritually minded, to know our own unworthiness, to be tolerant and slow to wrath, to be patient and forbearing, to be content to sow that others may reap, to work for results which we shall never see, to be the imitators and disciples of Him who was meek and lowly in heart? Depend upon it, we can throw away the gift of inspiration by our own inability to use it, just as others have done in the past. Is there not only too real a danger of our doing so? On the other hand we may—like more than one age of the Church—turn it to good account. We *need* not fail in the face of our trials. God help us to succeed. God keep us from all that will prohibit success. May He so support us, so chasten and correct and discipline us, that we may be able to feel His hand and hear His voice, as in His goodness He guides us a little nearer the final goal, a little closer to that unspeakable, unthinkable vision of 'all the truth.'

Keep Thou my feet, I do not ask to see
The distant scene; one step enough for me.

At the Literary Table.

RECENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

THERE is no literature so easy to get into circulation in Germany as the pamphlet: in this country the pamphlet will not circulate at all. So it sometimes happens that the most useful matter gets published locally and is never heard of, simply because the great publishers will not take a pamphlet up. Mr. A. C. Lomax of 'The Johnson's Head,' in Lichfield, has published an *Outline Sketch of the History of the Jews*. It is a pamphlet. But it contains, in the form of chronological tables, so clear an account of the History and Prophecy of Israel from 930 B.C. to 37 B.C., and their relation to foreign powers, that we hope this reference will induce some students to inquire about it.

It is just as difficult in reviewing as in anything else to disburden oneself of the natural bias. So we congratulate the *Guardian*. Its reviews recently have been excellent reading. There is one in the issue for 10th August of Dr. Forrest's 'Kerr Lecture.' 'Dr. Forrest is a Presbyterian, and therefore it was only likely that we should differ from him when he came to speak of certain questions.' But of these matters of dispute, 'being altogether subordinate to the main purpose of the book,' only one is even mentioned—the doctrine of the intermediate state, — and it is mentioned to blame 'the rash assertion of the Shorter Catechism,' not Dr. Forrest. Dr. Forrest is approved of, both in what he has attempted and what he has done. He has attempted to speak, not to the downright materialist or scornful rejector of Christianity, but to those thinkers who hover on the border line, respectful, nay, reverent; but only half believing. And he has

spoken to them. He has done well, says the *Guardian*, not to place the Resurrection in the front rank of Christian evidences, for it is the miracle of Christ's holiness as manifested in the Gospel records that must predispose the mind to accept the Resurrection and its spiritual meaning; and 'we are grateful to anyone who thus sends men back to the Gospels, and again to the Gospels.' Dr. Forrest is even acknowledged to be original where it is so hard to be original now. For 'he has added new force to the argument from Christ's self-assertion'; and the *Guardian* thereupon quotes that striking passage beginning, 'Christ never unites with the disciples in prayer.'

Mr. James Arnot of Edinburgh has published a sermon (price 3d.) on 'The Sabbath and the Christian,' which was recently preached by the Rev. R. J. Drummond, B.D. Its message is in this sentence: 'We need a great revival of the conviction that there is a God with whom men have to do, and to whom they are responsible, and at the same time the conviction that this God is willing to come into terms of the very closest intimacy with men, simply to flood their natures with the sense of His presence, and to afford them in Himself the most absorbing, satisfying subject of thought and affection.'

There are many who are alive now to the un-Christian influence of the papers that lie in vast piles upon the bookstalls. There are many who know that it is only homœopathically that the evil they do can be cured. Have they seen the *Christian Budget*, and have they seen it in that light? We have waited before speaking. But this is the twelfth number now, and we may speak. It is just as racy, just as easily read, as any 'Pick-me-up' on the stall. It is in all respects just like another of them — in all respects but one, it is wholly, heartily for Christ.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

C. H. SPURGEON'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY. Compiled from his Diary, Letters, and Records, By his WIFE and his PRIVATE SECRETARY. (*Passmore & Alabaster.* Vol. ii. 8vo, pp. 376, with illustrations. 10s. 6d.)

SECOND volumes, like second thoughts, are often best. The second volume of Spurgeon's *Autobiography*, being occupied with Love, Courtship, and Marriage, and a few things more, is of course far ahead of the first volume in interest, clean out of sight of it. Even the dailies have discovered that. They have rushed upon the love-letters and quoted them, as if it were a breach of promise case in the courts with which they had to do; which, God be thanked, it is not, but the most beautiful devotion, the most unbroken harmony, the most ardent mutual helpfulness in the way that leads to glory.

But that is only one side of the picture, and, after all, not one half of the volume. The other side is less attractive. It is less pleasant to ourselves, and perhaps it throws just a trifle of a shadow of unpleasantness over the hero of the book. It is the public estimate that was made of Mr. Spurgeon as he rose into reputation—or the journalistic estimate rather. It is not flattering to the journalists. Take a sentence out of a solemn article in the *Saturday Review* for 25th October 1856—

'Mr. Spurgeon does not create the state of feeling to which he owes his popularity. It is a melancholy reflexion that such a personage is a notable at all. It is no new thing that there should be popular delusions; but we had flattered ourselves that we had outlived the days of religious, or so-called religious, epidemics. . . . We should not deem Mr. Spurgeon entitled to the place which he at this time occupies in public attention—and certainly we should not trouble ourselves with any reference to his proceedings—did we not consider him rather as a sign and a result than an original. His success is simply of the vulgarest and most commonplace type.'

There is much more to the same or worse effect. It is not flattering to the journalists. The time came when Spurgeon could positively enjoy it. We need not wonder that it stung him a little at first. But there is just a touch of regret to know that there ever was a time when it stung him at all.

But the greatness of Spurgeon, his intrinsic victorious might, is manifest here, much more clearly than in the earlier volume. The *Saturday Review* article quoted ends with a disgusting reference to the calamity which occurred when Spurgeon first preached in the Music Hall of the

Royal Surrey Gardens. There was a great panic, seven persons were killed, and twenty-eight were seriously injured. It was the deed of persons intent on putting an end to the freedom of the gospel. And it would have daunted most men. Spurgeon suffered terribly: 'It shall not stop us, however,' were his words.

THE HOPE OF IMMORTALITY. By the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon. (*Seeley*. Crown 8vo, pp. 350. 6s.)

This volume is mentioned in another place, and will be mentioned again. For it is full of matter. It is enough here to put down its title, and to say that the chapter which describes 'the Christian Amplification of the Belief' is a most moving Christian appeal, on the ground of what lies on the other side of the grave, with the old fervour but the new knowledge.

GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH HEBREW GRAMMAR. Translated by G. W. Collins, M.A., and A. E. Cowley, M.A. (Oxford: *At the Clarendon Press*. 8vo, pp. xx, 598. 21s.)

Gesenius' *Grammar* is a fine example of the way the Germans make their books. Gesenius publishes the *Grammar* in 1813; then he works at it, and issues thirteen new editions before his death, each edition being an improvement on its predecessor. After his death, Rödiger takes it up, and between 1845 and 1872 produces seven new editions, and dies. Then Kautzsch begins; Kautzsch issues the 22nd edition in 1878, and the 26th in 1896. Thus, in the 26th edition, the book is much bigger and much better, in fact a wholly different book from that which Gesenius published first. And it is the 26th edition (or, to be precise, the 25th, with the additions and corrections of the 26th added) that Mr. Collins and Mr. Cowley have translated into English.

They have done more than translated it. They have corrected, completed citations, added literary references, and sometimes even notes. It is a finer book than even the latest edition of the original.

It is a grammar, indeed, of which any language as well as any author or combination of authors, might well be proud. We sometimes hear it affirmed dishonestly that the Hebrew is an unknown tongue. This is the sufficient answer. No doubt, if it were possible to know it better, a smaller grammar would do. But this grammar shows that it is known. The range of the unknown is gradually reduced, the unknown now is small and of quite subordinate importance.

The whole grammar is here. Nowhere else in one volume is the whole Hebrew grammar to be found so fully. Even Davidson's two volumes are scarcely so full as this. And it may safely be said that no one will pretend to a knowledge of Hebrew before he has mastered this great book.

THE LAND OF THE MONUMENTS. By Joseph Pollard. (*Hodder & Stoughton*. Crown 8vo, pp. xxxi, 456. 5s.)

It is a very great pleasure to see this second edition of Mr. Pollard's 'Notes of Egyptian Travel,' as he modestly calls his delightful book. It is only now and then that the book of travel reaches a second edition. To belong to the select band is to possess exceptional merit. What has given Mr. Pollard's book its pre-eminence? First its name, next its beautiful illustrations, but most of all its own absolute and unconscious truthfulness. It does not claim to be, but it is, an introduction to the study of ancient Egypt, as complete as any intelligent student need desire. The second edition is cheaper, and it is at the same time more valuable than the first edition. For it contains an additional preface, which deals with the recent discoveries in Egypt and the recent literature of Egyptology.

THE WORLD'S THIRD SUNDAY SCHOOL CONVENTION. (*S.S.U.* 8vo, pp. 335. 3s.)

This is the story of the Sunday Schools all the world over, as their teachers met in London in July last to tell it.

FAMOUS SCOTS: SIR WILLIAM WALLACE. By A. F. Murison. (*Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier*. Crown 8vo, pp. 159. 1s. 6d.)

The writers of the 'Famous Scots' Series are scholars. Their work is original work. So we do not look for a chapter out of our school histories when we open the volume on Sir William Wallace. Perhaps Mr. Murison has been a trifle *too* critical and cautious. It makes his volume a little hard to read. But it is a great thing to know that the severest sifting of the first sources leaves us with our Wallace, and leaves him all the hero we ever esteemed him. Mr. Murison shows

us that Wallace was the one man of his day, as Knox was alone in his day, and once more we see that Carlyle was a true Scotsman when he believed in heroes.

SIR THOMAS BROWNE: AN APPRECIATION. By Alexander Whyte, D.D. (*Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier*. Crown 8vo, pp. 90. 2s.)

Dr. Whyte deserves well of his generation in many ways, but our obligation is like to be greatest for the introductions he has given us to men and women who are worth knowing. The men and women are willing to be introduced to any of us. Some of us can go up to them and make a direct acquaintance. Some of us cannot, and the man to lead us by the hand is Dr. Whyte. And first he gives us to see that they are worth knowing. He has his own inimitable way of doing this—praise and great praise, and then a touch of reservation, and then more praise and greater. And lest we think the praise too much, he frankly calls it an appreciation. The introduction is made. Then comes the conversation—extracts from the writings, well chosen, even cleverly and audaciously chosen. We ought to go on to a full knowledge. Whether we do or not, we have made another friend.

TEXTS AND STUDIES: THE LAUSIAC HISTORY OF PALLADIUS. By Dom Cuthbert Butler. (Cambridge: *At the University Press*. 8vo, pp. xiv, 297. 7s. 6d. net.)

For the study of Monasticism in Egypt, to which so much attention has recently been given, the two most important documents are the *Historia Lausiaca* and the *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*. Of the former work Palladius is the reputed author. Born in Galatia, in 367 A.D., Palladius became a monk in 387, and shortly after went into the Nitrian desert, and returned, driven by ill-health, from its recesses in the year 400. In the same year he was made bishop of Helenopolis, in Bithynia. After some years' persecution for his fidelity to St. Chrysostom, he wrote his History, a series of biographical sketches of the monks whom he had known, and dedicated it to one Lausus, a chamberlain at the court of Theodosius II., whence its name.

Many questions lie unsettled around the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius. Dom Butler has gone to the original and all its versions, and settled not a few of them. He has shown that the *Historia*, as we have it, consists of two parts, one of which is the work of Palladius, the other not. He has shown that the genuine part is trustworthy as a source for the early history of Monasticism. And he has made it the basis of a most valuable brief history of the development of the monastic idea in East and West down to St. Benedict's time.

THE GUILD LIBRARY: BIBLE MANNERS AND CUSTOMS. By the Rev. G. M. Mackie, M.A. (*Black*. Crown 8vo, pp. 175. 1s. 6d.)

In the multitude of books describing Syrian travel and Syrian life, Mr. Mackie's *Bible Manners and Customs* will never pass unnoticed. It has a grace, a distinction, that cannot be overlooked. It is not only that the author is also the illustrator, and that both writing and drawing are veritable works of art, but, besides that, the book is steeped in Orientalism, every breath it draws being of the true Eastern atmosphere, so that we do not simply read a book about Bible manners and customs as they survive in Syria still, but we pass into the very manners and customs themselves. There is no man living who knows the modern Syrian better than Mr. Mackie. His own keen Christian sympathy has made it possible for him to enter into the unlikeliest thoughts and feelings; his actual experience is unrivalled. The little volume is sure of a wide welcome.

Some Pamphlets deserve mention:—

Allenson: *The Happy Warrior*, by P. T. Forsyth, D.D. 3d.

Arnot: *The Sabbath and the Christian*, by the Rev. R. J. Drummond, B.D. 3d.

Baptist Tract and Book Society: *Christian Hymns and Songs*, by W. E. Winks.

Eyre & Spottiswoode: *This is My Body*, by E. W. Bullinger, D.D. 1d.

Gardner Hitt: *The Church's One Foundation*, and *Nature and God*, by the Rev. J. Jamieson, D.D.

Nutt: *Worker and Trader*, by N. A. Graydon, C.E. 1s.

Partridge: *Here and Hereafter*, by G. W. Butler, M.A. 6d.

Stock: *The Priesthood of the New Covenant*, by W. H. K. Soames, M.A.; *Types of the Way*; *The Churches of the East*, by the Ven. W. M. Sinclair, D.D. 1s. 6d. nett; *The Man who feared God for Nought*, by Otis Cary.

Stoneman: *Ask*, by M. J. Pillans.

Williams & Norgate: *The Gospel Catechism*. 1s.

Macpherson's 'Christian Dogmatics.'[1]

Mr. Macpherson is well known as a careful expositor, and his previous works have been accorded an appreciative reception in the theological world. In this new book on Christian Dogmatics he has covered a much larger field than hitherto, and drawn upon a necessarily wider store of learning. There was certainly room for this effort. Whatever be the value of Hodge,—and the *Systematic Theology* is worth a good deal more than is often thought,—one has a distinctive feeling of its strongly polemic character, for it rather seeks to determine than guide the views of students in a definite direction. Compared with the *Systematic Theology* of Hodge, Mr. Macpherson's is of course a much smaller book, yet we are inclined to think it will prove on the whole the more useful of the two. A *student* will attain to his own reasoned views regarding dogmatics, and he does not so much require a master as a guide. This is what Mr. Macpherson's manual really is—a guide to the study of Christian Dogmatics from the standpoint of moderate Calvinism. No doubt the views of the author have been urged throughout,—it would be impossible to write such a book without this happening,—but they have not been unduly pressed to the exclusion of all others. Indeed, certainly not the least valuable contribution Mr. Macpherson has made, is to be found in the compendious and exhaustive list of the literature under any given subject. Thus a student, desiring to enter upon the great subject of the 'Sinlessness of Jesus,' on turning to this manual, will find (pp. 301–309) an accurate discussion of the question, which will serve as an excellent introduction; but, in the list of literature prefaced to the discussion, he will find himself directed to such works as Ullmann, Lobstein, Hering, Du Bose, together with a large number of minor and less-known contributions. He has thus material to follow out the subject for himself; and undoubtedly this is the only satisfactory method. Mr. Macpherson has, for the first time we believe in English, made this possible over the wide field of Christian Dogmatics; and provided what has certainly been a felt want not always met in the colleges of divinity. His book will, we have no doubt, be widely adopted, as what we conceive it is meant primarily to be, a text-book for students desirous of being thoroughly equipped in their subject. For this reason we heartily welcome it, and wish for it a generous circulation.

G. Elmslie Troup.

Broughty Ferry.

[1] *Christian Dogmatics.* By Rev. John Macpherson, M.A., author of *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, etc. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898. Price 9s.

Sermonettes on the Golden Texts.

By the Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A., Aberdeen.

I.

'Help us, O Lord, for we rest on Thee.'—2 Chron. xiv. 11.

This is a very familiar cry. None is more common in the Bible. 'Help, Lord,' is the frequent exclamation of the Psalmist. 'Lord, help me,' was the cry that Jesus often heard as He walked among the people. 'Help' was the cry from Macedonia that St. Paul heard in his night vision. It is a cry that very naturally arises in *emergencies*, and these come into all lives. In the first years of our life how helpless we are, how dependent on the care of those who love us! The human creature is at first the most helpless of all animals, and for a much longer time than any other. The chicken and the cub are far less dependent than the babe. And, as we grow up, we need help still, though we do not always so well realise it. We are apt to begin to think ourselves capable in all things, clever enough to face the world; we are inclined to scorn advice, and to disregard the experience of wiser heads. By and by, however, most of us get past that stage, and, finding that there is not so much genuine and generous help in the world that we can afford to think lightly of it, we learn to prize it in the case of the few who

specially love us and are interested in our welfare. But emergencies will arise where no human help will be of avail. The heart has to direct itself to a higher Source. 'Help, Lord,' is the ultimate cry of the soul.

It is not only in emergencies, however; it is well, too, that in the *enterprises* of life we should recognise our dependence upon God. Not only when we are baffled and beaten, but when we are going forward, even with high hopes, to the undertaking of some work to which we are called. The one sad thing in all Nansen's wonderful story of struggle and endurance, in his effort to reach the Pole, is that there is no reference in it, from beginning to end, to his dependence on a higher Power. It would be so refreshing to come upon some statement in it breathing the spirit of this prayer, 'Help, Lord, for we rest on Thee,' or of the utterance of the Psalmist, 'My times are in Thy hand.' It is a wonderful story of enterprise and emergency, and he came through, but it would be as the gem in the ring, were there even but one solitary reference to his trust in God. How different it was with Luther when entering on his career as a reformer! Great was the enterprise he had undertaken, and hopeless would have been the emergency had he trusted in his own strength and guidance; but his power lay in a deep, possessing, gladdening faith in the help of God. 'Little monk,' said a baron to him, when he was about entering the Diet of Worms, 'thou hast need of great courage, but if thou hast faith in these doctrines which thou teachest, in the name of God go forward.' Luther paused a moment, then replied, 'Yes, in the name of God, forward.'

How important to begin life in the spirit of the text! You, dear boys and girls, are entering upon the great enterprise of your life. It is greater far than you know of yet, and emergencies you do not dream of now will arise; but it means everything to go forward in that spirit. 'Keep me, O God! The sea is so great and my boat is so small,' is said to be the Brittany fisherman's prayer. The ocean of life on which you are embarked is a great one, and small and frail is your bark to contend with the storms that will arise; but, whatever happen, no abiding evil will befall you, you will weather all gales and reach the heavenly haven at last, if, together with all the skill and foresight and resolution you can acquire, there be a humble and sincere dependence upon God.

II.

'In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths.'—PROV. iii. 6.

THE word 'acknowledge,' as ordinarily used, sometimes means little, and sometimes much. It might signify merely a bow of recognition, or it might mean hearty appreciation, involving cost. It is needless to say that, applied to God, it ought to have a deep significance. It is a word used very frequently in business transactions. 'I beg to acknowledge the receipt,' etc. And that may suggest to us our subject here. Remember that our relationship to God should also be on a business footing. There are other ways in which you may look at it—ways more endearing; but do not lose sight of that one—it means business. Dr. Chalmers, the Scotch divine, was once at a meeting where the first speaker had given a rather lengthy address—very fine as a bit of oratory, but with nothing very much to the purpose in it. When he was done, the Doctor rose and said, 'After that brilliant introduction, let us now proceed to business.' It was a sharp rebuke, but in the circumstances probably not undeserved. They had not met simply to hear fine language, they were met to get some work done, and the sooner they proceeded to do it the better.

It was just the reverse way, you may remember, with the prophet Ezekiel. He, the speaker, meant business, but his hearers would have none of him in that sense. He was unto them, it is said, 'as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice.' Certainly they acknowledged him to a certain extent, but not in the practical way the prophet wanted. They listened to his earnest entreaties and exhortations, charmed by his eloquent pleading, but to them it was only like a good song, enjoyed for the time being, but with no lasting effect.

Now, a good song has its own time and its own value; and 'the song that stirs a nation's heart is in itself a deed.' The Bible is full of lovely songs, and about the only thing we are told of heaven is of the music that is there—as the song of Moses and of the Lamb. But, while all that is true, our acknowledgment of God must have the solemnity and regularity and fixedness of a business transaction about it. Our religion must be practical, and not lose itself in mere sentiment. 'Wist ye not

that I must be about My Father's business?' said the Boy Jesus.

Of course, as we said, there are higher ways of looking at the relationship. It is one of father and child, for instance, which means more, far more, than business. Still, the business aspect is a very important and fundamental one. Indeed, in earthly relationships of the dearest kind there is yet the business basis. In marriage, one might say, surely the vows of love are sufficient there. Well, that is the highest view to take of it, and without love it is worse than nothing. Still, the ceremony has to be gone through, the register has to be signed, and it may be all the better if there is an ante-nuptial contract. The whole thing has the fixity and legality of a business transaction. And in the daily dealings in the home life, it is very important to remember the business aspect. It may save friction and irritation, and prevent growing estrangement. If a boy borrows sixpence, say, from his brother, let him be very careful about the paying of it again. He might say, 'Oh, it is only my brother. He won't mind.' But just because he is your brother, be, if possible, all the more careful and correct even in money matters. True, he might not say anything, and might never ask again for the sum lent; but, all the same, if you are mindful and businesslike in these common transactions, mutual respect will not be endangered, and the higher meaning of brotherhood will be all the more fully established.

There is one thing that is a characteristic of good business, viz. that both parties benefit by the transaction. Gambling, for example, is not good business, because there what one party gains another loses. But in good business both parties —buyer and seller—are the gainers. The buyer gets the article he wants at a fair price, and the seller gets the just profit that is his due. Well, that is so in our relation to God. If we acknowledge Him honestly, justly, fully, that is what He wants, and He will be satisfied with His share of the bargain. And we, too, shall find that in every sense we shall profit, and that, for one thing, we shall not look in vain for needful guidance on our daily path.

III.

'And the men did the work faithfully.'—2 CHRON. xxxiv. 12.

THERE is no quality of human nature we come to prize more in life than that of faithfulness. What is it we look for, and appreciate most, in friends? It is the spirit of faithfulness. We can pardon many things in a friend—an error in judgment, a thoughtlessness of speech or action, even if it should bring loss or suffering to us. We can yet forgive these things, even as, perhaps, we need to be forgiven. But a breach of faith would take all the bloom and the aroma of the friendship away. What is it but their fidelity that attaches us to some of the lower animals? We know that the dog will be faithful to his master whatever befall. Come prosperity or adversity, he will not falter in his attachment. Though the heavens should fall, yet the dog will remain true in his regard. An Edinburgh lawyer said, some time ago, to this effect, that he was sick of mere intellect and cleverness. He could get as much of that as he wanted in the law courts. What he longed to see more of was the spirit of charity and faithfulness in life's relationships.

There are no more cherished incidents in our nation's history than those connected with faithfulness to duty in trying circumstances. Let me mention one that is well known. Nearly fifty years ago, a horseman came galloping at full speed up the streets of Cape Town. He was on his way to Government House with disastrous tidings. Putting his hand to his mouth, he shouted, as he galloped along, to the wondering people on the pavement, 'The *Birkenhead* has gone down!' Men's faces were blanched, and their hearts chilled, at the news. For a time they could hardly comprehend all that it meant—that the troopship, that had left the bay so gaily and gallantly but a few hours before, had sunk beneath the waves. But when, later, all the details became known, then a wondrous story was revealed, worthy to sparkle on 'the jewelled finger of Old Time,'—how the soldiers stood drawn up as on parade, looking calmly on while the boats, full of women and children, left the sinking vessel, none remaining for them; how they stood in their ranks motionless and silent, and, as the ship went down, sank with it, shoulder to shoulder, firing a parting volley ere they disappeared beneath the waters—

> 'There rose no murmur from the ranks, no thought
> By shameful strength unhonoured life to seek.
> Their post to quit they were not trained, nor taught
> To trample down the weak.'

In the text it is a very humble duty that is referred to—the repairing of the temple; but the

workmen did it faithfully, and what better than that could be recorded of them? Ruskin says that if two angels were sent down from heaven, one to conduct an empire, and the other to sweep a street, they would feel no inclination to change employments; each would carry out his orders heartily and do his work faithfully. Well, that may be true about the angels, but it does not quite hold good of men; for, if we are capable of any higher work, there is certainly nothing wrong in aiming at the higher. There is no virtue in being content to sweep a street if you can do anything better. Still, if that is the work you have to do for the time being, then it means everything to carry the spirit of faithfulness into the doing of it. We need to learn the beauty, in God's sight, of all service faithfully done.

Remember, too, that it is not the deed we do, but the spirit in which we do it, that makes it immortal from God's point of view. Oliver Goldsmith spent a lot of his time writing mere hackwork for the booksellers, in order simply to make a living; but, in the midst of it all, he devoted his strength and the special power of his genius to the production of a work which he hoped to make immortal. And he succeeded. The hackwork is all forgotten now, but his *Vicar of Wakefield* still survives. But in Christian work it is often just the hackwork that *is* immortal. Most of us have only hackwork to do in the world—common duties, nameless duties, that amount to little or nothing in the eyes of men. If faithfully done, however, they are everything, so far as we are concerned, in the sight of God.

> 'In all the great, the strange, the old,
> Thy presence *careless* men behold.
> In all the little, weak, and mean,
> Be Thou by faith as clearly seen.'

IV.

'I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I: send me.'—Isa. vi. 8.

In the first of this month's texts we had the human cry of help ascending to God—so common and so natural. Here we have, what we might hardly expect, God calling to men and asking help from them. He is all-powerful, yet it is through human agency that He works, at least in the advancement of humanity. You find that, in the mission field, one great object of the missionaries is to train up some of the natives to be missionaries themselves among their brethren. So God wants men to be so imbued with His grace that they shall go forth and be made blessings to others. And, indeed, that is the only way to keep any religion to yourself. There is an old saying that, if you have no religion to spare, you will soon have little to keep.

Observe, however, that there is *a connection between call and qualification*. It is not enough to have the volunteer spirit. A man might volunteer to be one of a lifeboat crew, and, from incapacity, might do more harm than good, might simply be in the way of the others, and would be filling a position that might otherwise have been occupied by a more capable substitute. When a prime minister is forming his cabinet, he does not throw open the positions to the whole Houses of Parliament, and say, Who will undertake the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer? who that of Foreign Secretary? and so on. No, he has, in his mind's eye, certain members whom he thinks best qualified, and he goes to them, and invites them to join him. The call comes to the best qualified. When that call came to Isaiah, it seems to be couched in general terms, and to mean, Who among mankind will go? But, remember, it was only Isaiah, and not all mankind, that heard it; and though the question is put by God in a general sort of way, yet all that it meant was simply this, 'Shall I send *you*? Will *you* go?'

Now we come to the response of the prophet, 'Here am I: send me,'—a hearty and decided answer. In the Bible the answer follows immediately upon the question, but there may have been a long time, for all that, between the first whisperings of the Divine call and this unqualified acceptance on Isaiah's part. Often the man to whom the call comes is the last to realise his fitness for the undertaking. Others see it before him. It was so, often, with those who were called to some special work by God. But God makes no mistakes. Moses was hard to persuade that he was the man to undertake Israel's deliverance. Luther was, for a time, troubled with the idea, so natural to a humble-minded man, 'Can it be possible that I alone am right, and all others, from the Pope downwards, wrong? May I not be presumptuously deceiving myself?' But once such men as these were convinced, they were ready to undertake, and faithful to the end.

'Ready, aye ready,' is an old motto. At the time it was first used, it probably meant simply ready for war, ready to retaliate, and that sort of thing. Taken, however, in a higher sense, there could not be a finer motto. Of all the titles that are given to St. Paul, or that he gives himself—as Paul an apostle, Paul a servant of Jesus Christ, Paul the chief of sinners—we should be inclined to place among the highest that of Paul the ready. He was ready to preach the gospel at Rome, ready to die at Jerusalem, ready to be offered, ready to every good work. It is evident from his life that he was ready for anything that was God's will.

But it is not simply to the wise and great and grown-up that God comes. To you also, as to young Samuel, the call will come according to your qualification. There are some things that may be best done by you, better than by older people. Here is a workman who has dropped his tool down a narrow pipe. He cannot put his hand down to take it out; his hand is too big. He calls a passing schoolboy, and asks him to put down his hand, and bring out the tool. The boy could do what the grown man was unable to do. And in some ways you may have greater influence, among brothers and sisters and companions, than older people — greater influence for good or evil. According to your qualifications, then, God's call will come to you also. May He quicken us all! May He open our ear to hear His calls, and inspire our heart to obey!

V.

'The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.'—Isa. xi. 9.

As the waters cover the sea. How do they cover it? *Completely*. There are no gaps or interspaces. The sailor is glad to get out into the open sea. Near the land he is watchful, but when his pathless track lies far from the shore, he is more at ease. They cover it, too, *abundantly*. There is nothing scanty about the sea. The average depth, geographers tell us, is about thirteen times the average height of land above sea-level. They also cover it *helpfully*. The waters seem to sever country from country, but, really, they are the best means of bringing far separate lands into communication with each other.

What a grand picture, then, is here suggested with regard to the knowledge of God! It will cover the earth completely. All shall know Him from the least to the greatest. It will be an abundant knowledge. As it is, the earth is full of the glory of the Lord. Everywhere, God. The cataract utters forth God. 'Every common bush afire with God,' but too often we only 'sit round it and pick blackberries.' It is one thing for God to be everywhere, it is another thing for God to be recognized everywhere. But in that happy time herein foretold, the glory of the Lord will be visible and adored, and men will get deep down into the Almighty's heart in the fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It will also be a helpful knowledge. It will not lead us to make less of this world's duties, but more. As the waters that seem to separate, yet connect all the more closely, remote lands, so the more truly men know God, the better will they know each other, and the grander will seem the duties of the common day. The whole world would be one great Garden of Eden if that gladsome time were come.

One great blessing resulting from that knowledge is specially mentioned in the chapter—'They shall not hurt nor destroy.' The wolf will not devour the lamb, nor the leopard the kid; the child will fearlessly play with the adder. It is something one can hardly imagine, that beautiful time when Nature shall no more be 'red in tooth and claw.' It may be but a poetical description of the peace and harmony of the Messiah's kingdom. But there is one part, at least, will be literally true. However it be with regard to the attitude of beasts to men, or to each other, man's attitude to the beasts will be one of thoughtfulness, gentleness, and mercy. It is said that a man's dog should be the better of his Christianity, and so it will. 'A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast.' And, of course, still more will it be true that man's attitude to his fellow-man will be what it ought to be. One of the saddest thoughts in connection with this earth of ours, as it is, is the frightful callousness and unconcern with regard to human life where God, as revealed in Jesus Christ, is not known. Think of a country like Dahomey, where the most prized ornaments are human heads stuck on poles along the highways. But, indeed, even in our own land, and when Christianity had laid some hold upon the nation, the time is not so far behind us when rebels' heads were fixed over city gates, and left to shrivel there.

The Church of Christ may be far from perfect

in our own day, but, at least, it stands for much that is beautiful and helpful among men, and it labours and prays for the fulfilment of its hope that righteousness and peace shall at last be universal. One comprehends that the Church—even the visible building of stone and lime—stands for some measure of realised blessing among men, by even such a simple story as that of the shipwrecked mariners, in doubt as to what sort of coast they had been cast upon,—whether the inhabitants were cannibals, or with some humanity in them,—and whose fears were quite relieved when one of their number, who had climbed a neighbouring hill, came rushing back, shouting, 'It's all right. We are safe. I saw a church spire in the distance.' The most practical and visible result of the universal knowledge of the Lord will be that men's relationship to each other will be of the happiest and most helpful kind. Then, from Czar to *moujik*, Queen to peasant,

> Let us pray that come it may,
> As come it will for a' that,
> . . . . .
> That man to man, the world o'er,
> Shall brothers be for a' that.

Contributions and Comments.

Yahveh in Early Babylonia.

In the August number of The Expository Times (p. 522), under the above title, Professor Sayce calls attention to an interesting West Semitic proper name dating from the Khammurabi dynasty, namely, *Ya-ú-um-ilu* (Bu. 88–5–12, 329; *Cuneiform Texts from Babyl. Tablets*, iv. 27). This name, in which the syllable *ya* is written with the usual notation, *i-a*, permits of no other reading, and presupposes a divine name, *Yâum*, i.e. *ya*, with the Semitic nominative ending and mimation. This is, of course, the masculine divine name *A-a* (which I have fully discussed in my *Ancient Heb. Tradition*, a name which may also be read *Aï* as well as *Ya*), only that in *Yâum* further the nominative ending presents itself.

Another interesting personal name, dating from the same period, is *Ḫa-li-pi-um*, occurring in a list of slaves (Bu. 91–5–9, 324, line 18, published in *Cuneiform Texts from Babyl. Tablets*, ii. pl. 23). Even before the appearance of Professor Sayce's article, I supposed that in this *-pi-um* we have the divine name *Ya-um*, since, as is well known, at that era and even as late as the Tel el-Amarna letters, the sign *pi* has also the values *wa* and *ya*. I hesitated, however, to publish this discovery, because I was unacquainted with any variant of this divine name written in the usual form *Yâum* (*I-a-um*). This *lacuna* has now been filled by Professor Sayce with his *Ya-ú-um-ilu*, and there can now be no doubt that *Ḫa-li-pi-um* (which as such gives no sense) should rather be read *Ḫa-li-ya-um*.[1] The name is of importance in two ways: first, on account of the divine name contained in it; but secondly, also on account of the first element *ḫa-li* (*khâlî*), in which one immediately recognizes the Arabic synonym of *'ammî*, 'my uncle' (cf. *Anc. Heb. Trad.* p. 84). It thus appears that, even at that early date, the paternal uncle (*'amm*) was distinguished by a special appellation from the maternal (*khâl*). The circumstance that in the theophorous proper names of the Western Semites *'ammî* occurs so frequently, while *khâlî* is very rare (not found at all in Hebrew proper names), certainly does not favour the ideas formulated by Robertson Smith regarding the matriarchate, for upon his theory we should have expected precisely the opposite, namely, a preponderance of *khâlî*.

Fritz Hommel.

Munich.

[1] It is also to be observed that an Assyrian eponym name of the ninth century B.C. appears as *I-a-ḫa-lu* (variant *A-a-ḫa-a-lu*), that is to say, we have the same name, only transposed (cf. the Heb. עַמִּיאֵל, *Ammiel*, and אֱלִיעָם, *Eliam*). In the *Journal of the Transactions of the Vict. Inst.* xxviii. (1896), p. 35, I already explained the name *Ya-khâlu*, in which Mr. Pinches had recognized the divine name *Ya*, as = 'Yah is my خال.'

Matthew xviii. 20.

WESTCOTT-HORT remark on this verse in their second volume: '18^{20} appears in D as *οὐκ εἰσὶν γὰρ δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα παῤ οἷς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*; *ger* $_1$ [that is the old Latin MS. from St. Germain, 15] adds to text an abridged form of the same. Western. Probably due to a misreading of the initial OY as *οὐ*.'

In the edition of 1896 a supplementary note is given by C. F. Burkitt (on p. 143), stating that Syr. Sin. (*i.e.* the Syriac version from Mount Sinai discovered by Mrs. Lewis) has the same reading: 'For there are not two or three gathered together in My name whom I am not in the midst of.'

The interesting form in which this Logion appears in the papyrus of Oxyrhynchus needs only to be mentioned, and we have gathered all that our latest and best critical editions of the New Testament have to say on this important saying of Christ. And yet, more than thirty years ago were published, by P. de Lagarde, the Four Gospels in Arabic from the MS. of Vienna (Leipzig, 1864; [see the *Bible Dictionary*, i. p. 137 *a*] the only edition containing the marginal notes which belong to the Alexandrine Vulgate), and therein the note to this verse; the Rumi (*i.e.* the Roman, Latin, or Greek text) shows: 'There are not gathered two or three,' etc.

There are other very remarkable readings attributed to the same source in this Arabic version,[1] but I am satisfied to call attention to this one. At the end of his preface, in which—by the way—Lagarde grumbles a little also with his English friends, 'who do not move a finger for research' (p. xx), he deplores that he, in his position, must be content after a heavy day's work at school to bring together with tired limbs in the evenings of his days, building-stones, which others shall—not use for building (p. xxxi). Lagarde, the incomparable worker, is dead, but let us be up to use at least the materials he has gathered.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

[1] In Latin they were published more than a hundred years ago by G. Ch. Storr, *de evangeliis arabicis* (Tubingae, 1775, 4^0) from the same MS.

On the Meaning of שִׁלְטֵי (constr. שִׁלְטֵי).

THIS word occurs in the following passages (I quote from R.V.):—

(*a*) 2 S 8^7 'the *shields* of gold that were on the servants of Hadadezer.'

(*b*) 1 Ch 18^7 (= 2 S 8^7).

(*c*) 2 K 11^{10} 'the spears (החנית) and *shields* that had been king David's.'

(*d*) 2 Ch 23^9 (= 2 K 11^{10}) 'the spears (החניתים) and bucklers and *shields*,' etc.

(*e*) Ca 4^4 'Whereon there hang a thousand bucklers (אלף המגן), All the *shields* of the mighty men.'

(*f*) Jer 51^{11} 'Make sharp the arrows; hold firm (mg. 'fill'; מלאו) the *shields*' (mg. 'the suits of armour').

(*g*) Ezk 27^{11} 'they hanged their *shields* upon thy walls.'

It is not a little surprising that in one passage only (*f*) does the R.V. show any hesitation in rendering this difficult word שִׁלְטֵי. Similarly, Buhl-Gesenius gives no hint that any other rendering than 'Schild' exists. Roediger (in Gesenius' *Thesaurus*), while giving the various renderings of the word, seems satisfied with 'scutum' himself. Siegfried-Stade, however, fully recognizes the doubtfulness of the meaning, and refers to the full notes of Thenius and Klostermann on 2 S 8^7.

The various renderings which have been given, and the authorities which support them, may be tabulated as follows:—

(1) *Shields* (A.V. and R.V.).

(*a*) Targ. of 1 and 2 Ch (תריסי and עניליא).

(*b*) Vulg. of 2 Ch ('peltas').

(*c*) Abulwalid, *Bk. of Roots*, ed. Neubauer ('a kind of מגנים'; with special reference to 2 Ch).

(*d*) Kimkhi on Jer and Ezk (מגינים), appealing to Ca 4^4. Also on 2 S. Also in *Bk. of Roots*, ed. Biesenthal-Lebrecht ('like מגנים'; with special reference to 2 Ch).

(*e*) [Aben Ezra on Ca acc. to the common text].

(2) *Quivers.*

(*a*) Josephus on 2 S 8^7 and on 2 K 11^{10} (*φαρέτρας*), *Antiq.* vii. 5. 3 and ix. 7. 2 (ed. Niese).

(*b*) LXX of Jer and Ezk.

(*c*) Symmachus of 2 S (in Field).

(*d*) Peshitta (שלטא *passim*, *i.e.* acc. to [Ephrêm on 2 S], and Barhebræus, 'quivers').

(*e*) Syr.-Hex. of 2 S, ed. de Lagarde (שלטא).

(*f*) Vulg. of 1 Ch, Jer, Ezk ('pharetras').

(*g*) Rashi on 2 S and on 1 Ch (אשפות), appealing to Jer 51^{11}. Also on Jer and Ezk.

(*h*) [Aben Ezra on Ca, ed. H. J. Mathews, 1874.]

(3) *Bracelets*, *Anklets* (*Collars*).

(*a*) LXX of 2 S (χλίδωνας).

(*b*) LXX of 1 Ch (κλοιούς).

(*c*) (?) Aquila (κλοιούς, cp. Field's *Hexapla* on 2 S 8^7).

(*d*) [Vulg. of 2 S 8^7 ('torques,' less prob. reading in Vercellone).]

(*e*) [Ephrêm on 2 S 8^7.]

(4) *Armour*, *Arms*, *Equipment* (Thenius and R.V. mg. of Jer 51^{11}).

(*a*) LXX of 2 Ch (τὰ ὅπλα).

(*b*) Aquila of 2 S, in Field (πανοπλίας).

(*c*) Vulg. of S and K ('arma'), and of Ca ('armatura')

(*d*) [Aben Ezra on Ca, ed. Smyrna, $18^6_7$5 (כלי מלחמה vel מיני הנשק, which latter is found also in the common text, but not in Mathews).]

It will be seen at a glance that ancient authority is anything but decisive as to the meaning of שלטים. It will also appear that undue weight has been given to single passages in interpreting the word. We will now weigh the evidence for each of the above renderings.

(1) *Shields.*

The passage which seems chiefly to have influenced early interpreters in favour of this rendering is 2 Ch 23^9 (as compared with 2 K 11^{10}), where the Chronicler has introduced מגנות immediately before שלטים. Thus (1) the Targ. and Vulg. give 'shields' in 2 Ch, though they give other renderings elsewhere; (2) Abulwalid and Kimkhi (each in his *Bk. of Roots*) specially refer to 2 Ch for 'shields.' A second passage which influenced Kimkhi is Ca 4^4, to which he appeals in commenting on Jer and Ezk.

Now neither of these passages is decisive for 'shields.' In 2 Ch 23^9 מגנות is not a gloss on שלטים; rather the Chronicler, missing one half of the familiar phrase, 'spear and shield,' added מגנות to fill up the gap. In Ca 4^4 שלטי is indeed parallel to מגן, but parallel words need not be strict synonyms (cp. *e.g.* Ps 105^{33}). Moreover, two considerations tell decidedly *against* the rendering 'shields'—(1) the authorities for it are comparatively late, *e.g.* the Targ. on Ch is probably much later than the LXX of 2 S or of the Prophets; (2) the שלטים were *upon* the Syrians, a phrase which suits any one of the other three renderings better than 'shields.'

(2) *Quivers.*

This rendering can certainly claim the strongest support of ancient authority, but again one passage (Jer 51^{11}) has had an undue weight with some early authorities.

The φαρέτρας of the LXX (and 'pharetras' of the Vulg.) in Jer and also in Ezk is due to the mention of 'arrows' in the same verse of Jer. So Rashi always appeals to Jer 51^{11} when he explains שלטים in his commentary, and Aben Ezra (ed. Mathews) refers to the same passage. On the other hand, the evidence of Josephus and Symmachus is strong support for 'quivers' as a traditional rendering. The former in a narrative parallel to 2 S 8^7 writes τάς τε χρυσᾶς φαρέτρας καὶ τὰς πανοπλίας, and following 2 K 11^{10} (= 2 Ch 23^9) δόρατά τε καὶ φαρέτρας καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον εἶδος ὅπλου. We might accept 'quivers' (1) if it suited 2 K 11^{10}, (2) if there were no more probable rendering.

(3) *Collars* (or *Bracelets*).

This rendering, again, seems to be due to undue deference to a single passage. It appears only in 2 S 8^7 and its parallel passage. Things of gold *upon* the Syrians must be *ornaments* of some kind, 'collars' *or* 'bracelets,' so the translators seem to have argued. This rendering, however, does not satisfy the majority of the passages in which שלטים occurs, and may be dismissed.

(4) *Armour*, *Arms*, *Equipment.*

There is good authority for this rendering. Little stress, indeed, can be laid on the LXX of 2 Ch, but Aquila's πανοπλίας in 2 S is strong support, although he may have given κλοιοὺς elsewhere. The 'arma' and 'armatura' of the Vulg. are important, because independent of the LXX and (as it seems) of Symmachus, Jerome's frequent resource in a difficulty. Next, if Aben Ezra be

quoted at all, he must be quoted for מיני הנשק ('kinds of armour' or 'of weapons') only, for the explanations 'shields' (common text) and 'quivers' (Mathews) are later glosses. Lastly, Josephus, though making *φαρέτρας* his first choice as a rendering, shows some inclination towards a general term by adding *καὶ τὰς πανοπλίας* on 2 S 8^7 and *καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον εἶδος ὅπλου* on 2 K 11^{10}.

Turning from ancient authorities we find that a consideration of the word itself speaks for such a rendering as 'arma.'

(*a*) שלטים *always* appears in the plural, even in 2 K 11^{10} (where it is coupled with the singular החנית, used collectively acc. to Kimkhi) and in Ca 4^4 (‖ אלף המגן). This plural admits an easy explanation, if the word is a synonym of בֵּלִים and מַדִּים. Moreover, the כל of Ca 4^4 falls in with the same interpretation; indeed, may not כל שלטי be a Grecism (*πανοπλίαι*) if אפריון (*ib.* 3^9) only a few verses off be *φορεῖον*?

(*b*) Jer 51^{11} can be translated, 'Take up the whole armour' (a rendering which satisfies מלאו).

(*c*) 'Arms, armour' suits the four remaining passages.

(*d*) Lastly, we can account for the ancient interpretation, 'quivers,' if we accept 'equipment' as the true rendering. The sword and spear and shield are *individualized* (if the expression may be used), but the quiver is simply the main item of the general equipment, of the *et cætera* in fact. Thus when the 'equipment' is spoken of, the 'quiver' may be uppermost in the mind, and so *tropically* 'equipment' may be a rough synonym for 'quiver;' cp. Gn 27^3.

My conclusion is that Thenius' preference for 'Rüstung' as the rendering of שלטים is justified by the facts at our disposal; and that Klostermann's 'bracelets' and the 'shields' of the A.V. are inferior renderings.

W. E. BARNES.

Cambridge.

P.S.—Jer 13^{23} (Targ.) האיפשר דישני . . . נימרא שלטי ריקמתיה = 'Can the leopard change his variegated armour' (or 'equipment'). Klostermann quotes this passage in favour of 'bracelets' ('rings') and Roediger for 'shields' ('shield-shaped spots'). Perhaps this is an instance of the use of שלטים (שלטין) as an independent Aramaic word; cp. Barhebr. on Ps 126^5 (127^5) ed. de Lagarde (שלטא = 'quiver'); but more probably the word is a loan-word in Aramaic.

The New Testament Coinage.

EVERY Bible handbook contains a short chapter on the coinage of the New Testament, but not one deals with the subject satisfactorily. Whatever authority the various authors may have as numismatologists, they seem in no case to have grappled with the difficulties of Bimetallic Currencies and Fixed Ratios. The Roman coinage, however, in the reign of Tiberius was on a basis so similar to that of the Imperial coinage to-day, that the question might be easily disposed of if it were only approached in the right way.

A note in the margin of the Authorized Version (Mt 18^{28}) gives the Roman 'penny' the long accepted, but quite erroneous, value of $7\frac{1}{2}$d. As the note is further interesting as an example of a false method of calculating value, it is worth quoting in full: 'The Roman penny is the eighth part of an ounce, which after five shillings the ounce is sevenpence halfpenny.' This estimate of the price of silver, or more exactly $60\frac{7}{8}$d., is still accepted as its par value; silver, however, is so far depreciated that its actual selling value is only 27d. per oz. In dealing with a silver coinage, such as the ancient shekel or modern rupee, this depreciation is a serious consideration; in dealing with the Roman currency it is of no importance whatever.

The Roman coinage, like our own, was on a gold basis, and just as our shilling is fixed at the twentieth part of a sovereign, though containing only 5d. worth of silver, so the *denarius* was fixed at the twenty-fifth of an *aureus*, irrespectively of its intrinsic value. The Imperial sovereign weighs $123\frac{1}{4}$ grains; the aureus weighed $126\frac{1}{4}$ grains. The sovereign, however, is three-fortieths alloy; the aureus was pure gold. The ratio of the aureus to the sovereign is consequently $126\frac{1}{4} \times 40 : 123\frac{1}{4} \times 37$. This gives £1, 2s. 2d. as the value of the aureus, and 10·6d. for the denarius.

It is interesting in this connexion to notice that as the ancient drachma corresponded to the denarius, so the modern drachma corresponds to the franc, or $9\frac{3}{4}$d., the Greek coinage having resisted any important alteration.

With silver in its present depreciated condition, the stater (Mt 17^{27}), or Jewish shekel, would be worth little more than a shilling. At the time, however, silver exceeded three times its present value, and the stater was equivalent to the tetra-

drachm of Antioch, but for purposes of exchange it was officially tariffed at three denarii (2s. 7d.).

As the denarius was a silver coin, and the daily pay of a private soldier, it is to be regretted that the suggestion of the American Revisers to translate it 'shilling' was not accepted.

D. R. Fotheringham.

Sigglesthorne, Hull.

The Beatitudes in the Twenty-third Psalm.

It has been said that 'the Psalter is in the Bible what the heart is in man.' It might also be said that the Twenty-third Psalm is in the Psalter what the Psalter is in the Bible; for in it is contained, and from it may be deduced, the fulness of life and thought that abounds throughout the Book of Psalms. But may we not go a step farther and say that in it also—in this short Psalm of six verses—there is to be found, as it were in prophecy, the essence of the blessed gospel of Jesus Christ as it was condensed in the memorable sayings of Jesus, called the Beatitudes? The parallel columns below are an attempt to exhibit this; and if there be reason and success in the effort, this Psalm may be said to owe its wonderful popularity to the fact that it *does* thus shadow forth the sources of comfort and blessedness fully revealed and clearly described in the words of the blessed Master. We take the verses of the Psalm in order, and arrange the corresponding Beatitudes in the parallel column, designating the ideas contained in, and common to, both by one title descriptive of the phase of blessedness referred to in each.

Two Beatitudes of Jesus have not found a place in the comparison, namely, 'Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy,' and 'Blessed are the peace-makers: for they shall be called the children of God.' One reason for this is, that the Twenty-third Psalm does not take into considera-

Title.	Twenty-third Psalm.	Beatitudes of Jesus (Matt. v. 3–10).	Comments.
Spiritual Satisfaction.	The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want.	Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.	The Lord is the Shepherd of those that seek to do His will.
Spiritual Contentment.	He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters.	Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.	
Spiritual Restoration and Spiritual Comfort.	He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.	Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.	Verses 3 and 4 of the Psalm are closely connected, as the 'yea' testifies, and both together find their parallel in the second Beatitude.
Spiritual Compensation.	Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.	Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.	The kingdom of heaven, foreshadowed in the Psalm as the Feast in the Fight before the enemy, is the rich compensation.
Spiritual Resignation.	Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life.	Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.	The *proud* in spirit seek to obtain or claim as a right; the poor in spirit *allow* goodness and mercy to follow them.
Spiritual Rest.	And I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever (margin, 'to length of days').	Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.	That 'rest which remaineth for the people of God.' 'In Thy presence there is fulness of joy.'

tion—what the gospel of Jesus could never overlook—the blessings which come through our relationship with our fellow-men. The Psalmist's own conduct showed the need of this completing gospel truth; for whilst at one time he would show himself merciful, at another he would 'breathe out cruelty'; whilst at one time he would pray for peace, at another he would invoke vengeance. There is, then, a blessedness in the Beatitudes, of which the Twenty-third Psalm has no foretaste.

Otherwise, how prophetic is it of the blessings and benefits of the gospel of Christ?

MARSHALL B. LANG.

Old Meldrum.

'The Palestinian Syriac Version.'

THE reply of the Rev. G. Margoliouth to my notice of his publication (*E.T.*, ix. 511, 562) rests, in its first part, on a misunderstanding of my words. His view that צביונא was an abbreviation of שפרות צביונא of the Harklensian Version, and showed an unmistakable dependence on the latter (*Liturgy*, p. 46; *Version*, pp. 4, 17, 18), appeared to me, and is really, so strange, that I was satisfied to mention it and call it so. What follows in my notice gives my own view, and does not take him to task for a supposition which he did not advance. In the passage from Kings is the most important difference from the LXX text: the reading *ἀποθνήσκων* for *θάνατος* (2 K 2^{20}). This is shared by Lucian, but also by the Peshito, and therefore the latter may be the source for our version, as well as for Lucian. That the publication of Mr. Margoliouth was written in October 1896, before the new texts in this dialect were published, I did not take sufficiently into account, as it came into my hands but in the present year, else I might have expressed myself in a different way; for this I willingly apologize.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Job xix. 25–27.

THAT the M.T.[1] is corrupt will not be questioned. For (*a*) נְקָפוּ זֹאת is impossible Hebrew, and the error is probably due to the copyist's reminiscence of the unique expression בְּנֹקֶף זַיִת (Is 17^{16}); the verb נקף is not suitable to the context and the plural cannot be right. (*b*) The word זָר, whether we take it to mean *stranger* or *another*, cannot be right; for it is scarcely probable that the person, Job was hoping to see, would not be seen by others, and it is difficult to imagine what good it would do Job if other people did not see that person. (*c*) The phrase כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי is entirely disconnected. Yet these difficulties by no means justify Dr. Bickell's emendation, in which he leaves out about a third of the original. His Hebrew is as follows (without points):—

ואני ידעתי גאלי חי
ואחרון על עפרי
יקם עדי נקמת זאת
ומשרי אחזה אלה
כלו כליתי בחקי

[1] M.T. = Massoretic Text.

(*Vienna Oriental Journal*, 1892, p. 329). I can only translate one of the three altered lines, namely, the fourth: 'And a curse will take hold of my opponents.' The two other emended lines, that is, the second and third, I cannot translate, not knowing the grammatical relation of וְאַחֲרוֹן to יְקוֹם עֲדִי. Dr. Bickell cites Job 7^{21} 17^{16} 21^{26} to show that עָפְרִי in the second line may mean *my grave*. I confess I cannot find this meaning in these passages nor anywhere in the Old Testament, and משרי in the fourth line, for the usual שְׁרֵרַי, does not occur, and does not sound like Hebrew. But the last line but one is exegetically impossible; for the general tone of the chapter forbids us to think that Job was in a cursing mood. The most serious objection, however, to Dr. Bickell's restoration is, How are we to account for the intrusion of the extra matter into the M.T.? Can the superfluous words be explained as clerical errors of sound, sight, or reminiscence? The versions are quite against Dr. Bickell. The Vulgate and Sahidic imply the M.T.; the very blunders of the Syriac bear witness to it. The line 27^a, for example, is wanting in this version, because it is almost a dittograph of, and identical in meaning with, the preceding line. In 27^b the translator read רָאוּ לְאוֹר וְלֹא זָר as רָאוּ וְלֹא זָר, *i.e.* חזי נוהרא, thus leaving out a ו as dittograph, and read בְּחֵקִי for the M.T. בְּחֵקִי. The LXX, though corrupt, imply the M.T. It is to be observed that the LXX. nowhere translate the word אַחֲרוֹן as they do in Is 44^6 48^{12}, where the word is an attribute of God, *i.e.* *μετὰ ταῦτα* and *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* respectively, —a beautiful and correct representation of Him who is *last*, not by comparison, but the *Ever-last*. Notice, by the way, that גֹּאֵל is, in the former passage, parallel to אַחֲרוֹן just as it is in Job. Therefore, the line *οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀένδαός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων* is a good sense rendering of the Hebrew, read thus:—

וַאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גֹּאֵלִי הוּאאַחֲרוֹן

Undoubtedly, Dr. Bickell is a Hebrew scholar, and would never have so mutilated the original but for his fond theory that Job must have written in a particular metre. Surely Job's faith was above *measure* and his inspired message to sinful man greater than his Muse! Against this it might be urged that the theory of metre is established by cumulative proof; that is, there are many corrupt passages in Job which may easily be restored on this hypothesis. But all this is in itself a great assumption. I venture to say (1) that many passages appear to us corrupt because, owing to the scanty literary remains of

Biblical Hebrew, we cannot quite understand them. (2) Those that are admittedly corrupt may be restored without metre, but one must understand the idiom and genius of the language thoroughly. I regret that, for the sake of defending the truth, I am compelled to seem self-asserting. The chief error in this passage is בְּחַקִּי for the original חִבּוּ; the cause of error being (1) the unusual number of the guttural letters א, ה, ח, ע, and כ in verses 24–27. (2) There is positive proof that the words כֹּחַ, חֹק, חֹק, and חֹק, have been the cause of error in the following passages. In Hos 8^1, the LXX represent אֶל חִכְּךָ by *εἰς κόλπον αὐτῶν*, which implies אֶל חֵקָם; in Ps 22^{16} it is self-evident that כַּחִי is an error for חִבִּי; in Pr 20^{29} כֹּחָם is, by the LXX, translated *σοφία*, חָכְמָה, anticipating the ה of the next word וְהֶדֶר; מַחֲקֵי, Job 23^{12}, was read בְּחֵקִי by the LXX and Vulgate, *i.e.* *ἐν δὲ κόλπῳ μου*, *in sinu meo*. (3) The assumed original חִבּוּ is preceded by two words, and followed by one, beginning with the guttural כ. I should therefore read the Hebrew as follows:—

ואני ידעתי גאלי חי
ואחרון על עפר יקום:
ואחר עורי נקפא וחם בשרי
אחזה אלוה:
אשר אני אחזה לי ועיני יראו
לעזר כל כליתי חבו:

'And I know that my Redeemer liveth,
And the Everlasting shall stand on the earth.
And after my skin is coagulated (hardened), and
My flesh has become sound, I shall see God.
Whom I shall see for myself, and my eyes behold:
All my inmost affections have hoped for a Deliverer!'

With 26^a compare Ez $37^{6.8}$ 15^5, Is 1^6, Ps $38^{4.8}$.

N. Herz.

Rest and Comfort.

In The Expository Times of February 1897 (p. 239) I pointed out, with reference to Luke 16^{25}, Gn 5^{29}, and other passages, that rest and comfort are almost identical for Semitic feeling. I was not aware, then, that from the two manuscripts from which Mrs. Lewis is bringing out the new edition of the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*, the one has really מתנחם, 'he is *comforted*,' in Lk 16^{25}; the other מתניח, 'he is *at rest*.' Resch, in the Hebrew translation, which has just appeared, renders נָח, 'he is *at rest*.' In the *Bible Dictionary* I miss a reference to this suggestive passage in the article *Comfort*.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

The Etymology of יהוה.

In the September number of The Expository Times (p. 531) an account is given of an article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* of last July by Mr. G. H. Skipwith, who contends that the etymological sense of *Yahveh* is 'he will be,' which is an abbreviated form of the fuller expression 'God will be' (*Yahveh-el*) in the sense of 'God will be with us.'

That this is the only possible etymology of *Yahveh* I emphasized even a year ago in that sorely abused book *Ancient Heb. Tradition* (p. 115), and appealed further (p. 101) to the ancient Babylonian proper name *Ikûn-ka-ilu*, 'may God be (exist) for thee.' I am able now to cite another interesting analogue, namely, the Ethiopian name *Yekûnô-amlâk*, 'may God be (exist) for him' (*amlâk* being *plur. majestat.* for *malik*; cf. the divine name Milcom among the Ammonites).

Further, I am still of opinion that it was Moses who first, attaching himself to older ideas, as these present themselves in the name *Ikûn-ka-ilu*, transformed the ancient Semitic divine name *Aï* or *Ya* (with nominative ending *Yâum*) into *Yahveh*, and in this way gave to it a new content of meaning. If the Semites of Babylonia from the time of Sargon of Akkad preferred to give the name *Ea* to the ancient Babylonian earth-and-sea god *En-ki* ('lord of the earth'), this is an instance also of Western Semitic influence. *Ea*, who is also the creator of man and who formed him from the clay, *Ea*, the 'good' god *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, probably became the earth-and-sea god through his identification with *En-ki*. And if *Ea* (pronounced *îa*) is originally simply a fusing of the Western Semitic creator of the world and god of heaven, *Ia*, with the Babylonian earth-and-sea god, *En-ki*, then it is also explicable how in the Hebrew collection of Psalms, a priminite *Ea* hymn very slightly retouched should have been preserved from the time of Abraham in the anonymous Psalm 93.

Finally, let me still remark that as the forms *A-a* (pronounced *aï* or *î*; cf. Heb. אִי in proper names, *Ancient Heb. Trad.* p. 116) and *I-a* (pronounced *ya*) interchange, so also the name of the god *Ea* is written not only *E-a* (*e* the sign for 'house') but occasionally also *A-e* (Greek Ἄος).

Fritz Hommel.

Munich.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHAT is it that keeps us back from the practice of prayer for the dead? We can enter, says Dean Plumptre, without much effort of imagination, into the workings of the heart of the man who first considered that the prayers which he had offered for friend or brother during his life need not cease, and ought not to cease, at his death. Yet it is only one man here and one man there in all the Reformed Church that has followed the practice. What is it that keeps us back? It is mainly this, that for the Reformed Church the Bible is still the authority for religious practice, and the Bible does not encourage prayer for the dead.

Dean Plumptre thinks that the Bible does encourage it. He quotes from the Apocrypha, which we need not mind. He also says that the prayer of St. Paul for Onesiphorus, as distinct from his household, that 'he may find mercy of the Lord in that day' (2 Ti 1^{16-18}), is probably an example of prayer for the dead. He even refers to a certain 'scholarly and thoughtful article' in the *Church of England Quarterly Review* for April 1880, which finds an instance of prayer for the dead in Ps 132^{1}, 'Lord, remember to David all his anxious care'—assuming of course the post-Davidic date of the Psalm. And he rests his scriptural case on that. So it is evident that the Bible does not encourage it, and the Church will not have it.

Here and there, however, we find an unsuspected Protestant believe in it. The latest and most surprising is Bishop Welldon. In his book on *The Hope of Immortality*, already noticed here, Bishop Welldon suddenly lays down the precept that we may and must pray for the dead. He does not rest the doctrine on Scripture. At least he does not rest it upon 'isolated passages' of Scripture. He rests it upon the doctrine of the Communion of Saints.

Without prayer for the dead the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, he thinks, has nothing in it. It is prayer for the dead that creates and energizes the assurance that the dead are still the living. If we do not pray for them, we do not believe that they are, far less have communion with them. The practice of prayer for the dead does not rest on isolated passages of Scripture, but it does rest, he argues, on the whole conception of immortality there. It was not taught by Christ, but the doctrine of the Communion of Saints was taught by Christ, 'and from that doctrine flows the spiritual sympathy of which

intercessory prayer is the expression, between the living and the dead.'

The last word of the Old Testament is an old offence. In his little book with the curious title, elsewhere noticed, Mr. G. Campbell Morgan seeks to remove it.

The last sentence of the Old Testament is 'Lest I smite the earth with a curse.' The last sentence of the New is 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with the saints'—as the Revised Version has accurately restored it. Now 'curse' and 'saints' have one idea underlying both. It is the idea of separation or devotion to God. The city of Jericho was devoted, separated to God. When Achan took of the devoted thing, he himself was devoted. The people of God as 'saints' are set apart to God. Achan was devoted to God for judgment; the saints are devoted for glory. But the one idea lies under both. It is the absolute sovereignty of God. When God's sovereignty was wearied under the Old Covenant, it was realized under the New. The law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

When we go back as far as we can go, we come to what the Bible calls 'the beginning,' and 'in the beginning' we find God. But God is not alone. 'In the beginning was the Word,' adds the evangelist. And this Word, he afterwards tells us, is Jesus Christ. For he says (1 Jn 1^{2}) 'the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.' It is Jesus Christ. He says he has seen this Word, which was in the beginning with God and was God, he has seen and heard, and his hands have handled Him. It is Jesus Christ.

Therefore, the life of Jesus Christ begins before the birth in Bethlehem. Most of our 'Lives of Christ' begin with that, and are in error. Mr. Alexander Patterson, who recently wrote a volume on *The Greater Life and Work of Christ* (which was published by the Fleming H. Revell Company of Chicago), begins with 'Christ in the Eternal Past.'

But is there anything that we know of Christ in the eternal past beyond the fact of His existence? Yes, we know what He was doing. Says the evangelist again, 'He was in the bosom of the Father' (Jn 1^{18}), and that is the evangelist's Hebrew way of saying that he was in enjoyment of the Father's love. John himself leaned on Jesus' breast at supper, and Lazarus was received into Abraham's bosom. Both are the ancient Eastern figure for the enjoyment of sheltering love. But yet more plainly Jesus tells us what He was doing in the eternal past. He says, 'Father, I will that they also whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am; that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast given Me.' And what is this glory that He would have them see? It is the glory of being loved of the Father. 'For,' He adds, 'Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world.' His life in the eternal past was a life of glory, and that was where the glory lay—He was loved of the Father.

But more than that, we can tell how the thoughts of the Father and the Son were occupied. Their thoughts were of man. They were not exclusively of man, but they were of man. First, they were bent upon the creation of man, 'Let us make man.' The plural is explained in many ways. There is no way that is less objectionable, even less historically objectionable, than this. There is no way that gives us so much theological meaning. But their thoughts were also bent upon the redemption of man. 'Ye were redeemed,' says the Apostle Peter (1^{18-20}), 'not with corruptible things, with silver and gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of

Christ: who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times for your sake, who through Him are believers in God.' And finally, their thoughts were intent upon man's sanctification, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ: even as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before Him in love' (Eph $1^{3.4}$).

Now in all this the interest of the Son was great. For He was chosen to be the minister of the creation of man, of his redemption, and of his sanctification. And He knew what it would cost Him. We read in the Apocalypse (Rev 13^{8}) of 'the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.' In spite of its surprise, expositors take the expression in this meaning. He foresaw Himself as the Lamb. He was slain from the foundation of the world. His interest in the work that lay before Him in time was surely very great.

In the new volume of sermons by the late Professor Hort, which Messrs. Macmillan have published (*Cambridge and other Sermons*), there are two which go together. One of them is headed 'The Church and its Members,' the other 'Baptism and Confirmation.' The first defines the Church. And the definition of the Church of which Professor Hort approves, he finds in 'a form of prayer ordered to be used, and still sometimes used, before sermons.' The form is 'Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world.'

Professor Hort knows no other use of the name Church than that. His own 'little congregation' is a part of that whole, 'an image of the universal Church.' But he calls it a congregation. 'The Church,' he repeats in the second sermon, 'is the whole number of Christian people who ever lived at any time, and who are now living in any place.'

If, then, that is the meaning, and the only meaning, of the word Church, what does Professor Hort understand by Baptism? He says that we cannot tell what Baptism is until we have seen what the Church is. He has stated the meaning of the Church in his first sermon; in his second he states the meaning of Baptism.

The first thing to notice about Baptism, says Professor Hort, is that 'it is the way of becoming a member of the Church.' He says there is more in Baptism than that. He afterwards says that that is only half the truth about Baptism. What the other half is, we shall see in a moment. In explaining this first half, he divides it into two aspects. He quotes the words, 'We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock,' and he says that in one aspect it concerns us, in another it concerns the child.

It concerns us, because we are a congregation of Christ's flock, because we represent the Holy Church throughout the world. We take the child into our number simply because our number is a fragment of the great number of the redeemed. The act reminds us that we are not separate, that we are not complete; it reminds us of the large meaning of 'membership'; it recalls the sacred duties which we owe to the other members.

And it concerns the child. For the child is then and there taken from the outer darkness and loneliness of the stormy world. As it grows up, all Christian influences surround it, 'not by accident, as might happen to a child not baptized, but as its proper right.' It has not to win its way by special trials, so as to be counted as one of the worshippers of Christ. We treat it as one whose true home is in the Church. We treat it as from its earliest youth a Christian. And so the years pass by. The child grows up to youth. It was accepted as a Christian by its baptism in infancy,

though it was too young to know or understand anything about Christ, much less believe in Him. But those who believe in Christ must confess Him. Therefore, it is but right that the same profession should be openly made by those who were too young to make it for themselves before. They make it now, says Professor Hort, before the bishop, as representing the great Catholic Church, and we call it Confirmation.

The first half of Baptism, then, is entrance into the Church. It is the act of the members of the Church. The other half is the act of God alone. 'By Baptism God declares us to be His children.' God 'has ordained a certain pledge by which each man may assure himself that he has a right to say, "I am a child of God," and that pledge is Baptism.'

Yet Baptism is not to Professor Hort 'a conjuring trick, by which something starts into being within the child which was not there before. The water can do no more than common water. The words can do no more than common words. But the whole Baptism, water and words together, is what Christ Himself appointed as the way of entrance into the kingdom of God. God by it formally acknowledges the child as His own, gives him by it a right and title to enter on all the benefits which belong to His children. Henceforth the child, as he grows up, may look back to his baptism, and take comfort from it in knowing that he is no stranger to the Almighty God in heaven above.'

That is Professor Hort's theory and practice of Baptism. Speaking to his village congregation he does not once mention the word adult.

The writers in *The New World* (Gay and Bird) are prepared to be called 'advanced,' and they generally take pains to deserve it. Still there are exceptions. In the current number, the number for the quarter beginning with September, there is an article by Dr. Orello Cone of Boston which contains this as one of its first sentences: 'The Old Testament prophecy that the Messiah should come out of Judah, or that He would be a lineal descendant of David in the natural order, their age could not let stand in its original sense, and accordingly produced the legend of the miraculous conception of the mother of Jesus.' There is also a review by Professor Howison of California, which speaks of 'the deep and real grounds, psychological and epistemological, of the ever-growing human distrust of the miraculous.' But between these two papers there lies an article by Dr. J. H. Denison of Williamstown, which seeks to show the belief in the miraculous to be as reasonable as ever it was, undisturbed by science, untouched by philosophy.

Miracles, says Dr. Denison, are undisturbed by science. It is true that there is a widespread notion that the miracles of Scripture have been discredited by science. But it is a delusion. Nothing could be farther from the truth. It is not science but philosophy that has cast the miraculous in a dubious light, and that is a different matter. Science has to do with physical phenomena and their cause. Within that region it reaches results which are practically exact. But miracles, if there are miracles, lie outside that region. To get at them science must call in the aid of philosophy. And philosophy never reaches perfectly exact results. Philosophy, therefore, may cast miracles in a dubious light, has so cast them for the moment in many minds, but it never can disprove them.

This does not mean that men of science are no longer found who disbelieve the miraculous. They are not so numerous as they used to be, but they are still there. Only they are never men of science pure and simple. When they disbelieve the miracles of the Bible, they are partly also philosophers. Their method is to lay down a general thesis. The latest form of this thesis is a modification of Hume's famous postulate. It is laid down in this form: 'A

miracle is contrary to a law of nature; therefore an overweighing amount of evidence is required to prove it.' Now this position is not scientific. It is partly scientific and partly philosophical. Science has investigated part of nature and discovered its laws. It has not covered the whole breadth of nature. In order to exclude miracle from nature altogether, it must summon philosophy to its aid. Philosophy penetrates into the regions where physical science cannot go, and it makes discoveries there. But even if it comes back to tell us that in all its search it has not found the miraculous, we have not reached the postulate that miracles do not occur. For philosophy has to do with theories, it can never determine facts.

One of the ways in which science is used to discredit miracle is the way of accumulation. A vast stock of marvellous stories is gathered from all the nations upon the face of the earth. These stories are mythical. They bear some outward resemblance to the miraculous stories of Scripture. The conclusion is drawn that all stories of a like nature are mythical, and the miracles of Scripture are mythical also. To not a few this conclusion is irresistible and final. But it goes beyond its rights. In the first place, careful observation reveals more and more clearly the fact that there is a large class of apparently supernatural phenomena which cannot possibly be explained by it. And in the second place, the myths that have been accumulated are actually of a different order from the miraculous narratives of Scripture. They are simply marvellous; the miracles of Scripture move in an atmosphere that is moral and spiritual.

Take an illustration. When the first accounts of falling meteors came to hand, men of science rejected them. Scientific observation had established certain facts about the atmosphere. These facts were not contradicted by the falling of meteors. But where science stopped, philosophy began. Philosophy speculated that the atmosphere extended only a few miles, and that was accepted as a law of nature. But if the atmosphere extended only a few miles, falling meteors were impossible. So then they contradicted a law of nature, and, therefore, they required a supreme weight of evidence to prove them. The evidence that came to hand at first came from men who were untrained in scientific methods. Their stories were accounted for by the general love of the miraculous and by the ignorance of the common mind.

In order, then, to free the miracles of Scripture from oppositions of science, we have but to claim that they belong to a sphere that is beyond its ken. Science must then hand over their investigation to philosophy. Philosophy may be hostile or friendly. But being philosophy and not science, it can never decide the question. Its results are never complete and final.

Now the claim which Dr. Denison makes for the miracles of Scripture, and especially for the miracles of the New Testament, is that they do move in a sphere that is beyond the reach of science. It is the sphere of intense spiritual exaltation. St. Paul's expression for it is, 'the baptism of the Holy Ghost.' This 'baptism' is an ethical fact. Its fruits are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness, temperance. And even when its fruits were insufficiently realized, the fact of its existence was unquestioned. There were unseemly divisions among the early Corinthian Christians, but the baptism of the Spirit still made them Christians. That was their one hall-mark. And everyone who had it recognized the obligation which lay upon him to realize its ethical fruits. Now it is to this ethical exaltation that St. Paul attributes the miracles. They are all results of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. Denison does not say that science has nothing whatever to do with these miracles. The exaltation from which they come is partly physical.

It expresses itself in trances which come partly within the physical range, as well as in specific operations on the body, which come largely within that range. To that extent they belong to the field of scientific investigation. And they meet the demands of science. As phenomena, as facts, they are as fully and as credibly attested as science can reasonably demand. The letters of St. Paul to the Galatians and Corinthians have been sifted by the most thorough criticism, and pronounced authentic. Their date has been fixed at not more than thirty years after the crucifixion. St. Paul, as an eye-witness of what he relates, is just as trustworthy as Pliny. His account of the extraordinary things which occurred under his own observation are as much entitled to credence as Pliny's account of the eruption of Vesuvius. In fact, St. Paul's evidence is the more valuable, because it is so incidental. His letters are not written on the subject of miracles, or to prove them. They are written to people who, like himself, experienced such things, and his allusion to them grows out of the necessary discussion of Church affairs. In short, the miracles to which St. Paul bears witness carry all the credibility to science that past events can ever carry. If science rejects that evidence, it is not because it is insufficient for that part of the miraculous which comes within the range of scientific search; it is because science has ceased to be science, and, becoming philosophy falsely so called, has pronounced that miracles do not occur.

The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual.

By Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Aberdeen.

III. Thanking the God.

The first class of votive inscriptions takes the simple form, 'I, so-and-so, thank the goddess.' This is one of the most widespread votive formulæ. At Hierapolis, in the Lycos Valley, Φλαβιανὸς εὐχαριστῶ τῇ θεῷ (*C.B.*,[1] No. 17); at Ephesus, εὐχαριστῶ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, Στέφανος, and εὐχαριστῶ σοι, Κύρια Ἄρτεμι, Γ.Σκάπτιος (*C.B.*, p. 90; Inscr. Brit. Mus., 578, 579); in the Katakekaumene, δυνατῇ θεῷ εὐχαριστῶ Λητῷ (*C.B.*, p. 90); at Dionysopolis, εὐχαριστῶ Μητρὶ Λητῷ (*C.B.*, No. 53).

No phrase is more characteristic of Pauline expression and thought than 'I thank God' (or 'my God'), εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ (μου)—the same words rise to the mouth of Paul in addressing the Colossians, for example, that must have been familiar to them in their pagan days.

The word εὐχαριστῶ is not confined to inscriptions of this simple form. Sometimes, in those of the third class, the participle takes the place of the finite tense, εὐχαριστοῦσα ἀνέστησεν (*Smyrn. Mouseion*, No. φο'), which is really equivalent to εὐχαρίστησε καὶ ἀνέστησε. Sometimes the dedicatory inscription is called a 'thanksgiving,' εὐχαριστήριον: this word is not used in the New Testament.

In Christian inscriptions of Syria a similar formula occurs. Compare le Bas-Waddington, No. 1917, Ἰωάννης Σεουήρου χαρτουλάριος εὐχαριστῶν τῷ Θεῷ μου ἐκ θεμελίων ἔκτισα, and No. 2459, εὐχάριστου αἰὲν οὖν τῷ παντοκράτορι Θεῷ.

IV. Blessing the God.

A rare class of votive inscription is found in the Katakekaumene. 'We bless (the god) on behalf of Hermophilus,' εὐλογοῦμεν ὑπὲρ Ἑρμοφίλου (*Smyrn. Mous.*, No. φοβ'). This inscription might at the first glance be taken for Christian; it expresses the same thought as Luke in the last words of his Gospel (24^{53}): 'They were continually in the temple blessing God,' εὐλογοῦντες τὸν Θεόν, or 1^{64}, 'He spake, blessing God,' ἐλάλει εὐλογῶν τὸν Θεόν. The word is common and characteristic in the Synoptic Gospels. James (3^{9}) has εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον καὶ πατέρα. Paul, on the other hand, tends to use

[1] As I shall frequently have to refer to the text of inscriptions published in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, I use the abbreviation *C.B.* to denote it.

εὐλογεῖν in the sense of blessing men; and he employs εὐλόγητος ἔστω when he blesses God.

But, though only one example of this formula in the votive inscriptions is known, yet the verb εὐλογέω is sufficiently common in the next class, in which the person who has been chastised for his sin by the god, dedicates a stele, blessing the god or the wonderful works of the god (ε(ὐ)λογῶν σου τὰς δυνάμ(ε)ις). The stele which is dedicated is in one case called εὐλογία, 'I dedicated a blessing' (sec. xiii.).

The following case stands midway between the two classes. Metrophanes and Flavianus, the two orphan sons of Philippicus, had been plundered and ill-treated in their helplessness; and the god had destroyed (διέφθειρε) their enemies, and the village had punished them. Wherefore, when the god demanded it, one of them, in 210 A.D., dedicated an inscribed stele, blessing the divine power, because [etc.]: [δι ὃ ἀπαιτηθε]ὶς ἐστηλλογράφησα [εὐλογῶν τὰς θει]ας δυνάμ(ε)ις, ὅτι [—].[1]

Here no sin has been committed by the dedicator (which would place it in the following class,) but a debt has been incurred by him, and payment is demanded by the god. But a debt approximates closely to a sin; and in the inscriptions one instance of the close connexion between the two ideas occurs in the phrase used by the Lycian slave Xanthos, ἁμαρτίαν ὀφ(ε)ιλέτω Μηνὶ Τυράννῳ, ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξειλάσασθαι, 'Let him be a debtor to Men in respect of a sin (*i.e.* let him be guilty of a sin) which he shall not be able to expiate.' The same approximation of the terms 'debt' and 'sin' is found in Lk 13[2-4], where the expression changes from ἁμαρτωλός to ὀφειλέτης, without any real change of sense, apparently from mere aiming at variety in verbal expression.[2]

The inexpiable sin, which is mentioned in the quotation from Xanthos, made in the preceding paragraph, consists in prying curiously into the things of the god, ὃς ἂν πολυπραγμονήσῃ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ περιειργάσηται, ἁμαρτίαν ὀφειλέτω κ.τ.λ. There is an interesting parallel in the Gospels (Mk 3[29]), ὃς ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον . . . ἔνοχος ἔσται αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος (comp. Mt 12[31f.], Lk 12[10]): here the whole formula has precisely the form in which hundreds of threats and denunciations against the guilty are expressed in the inscriptions of Asia Minor (see sec. v. *ad. fin.*).

Deissmann's note on the words of Xanthos bring out some other noteworthy biblical parallels, which I need not repeat (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 52).

It must be remembered in estimating all these cases and parallels, that we have not merely to put the question, What did Paul (or any other writer concerned) mean by these words? It would often be impossible to frame a reply to that question. But in such cases the question can often be put with profit, What meaning would the recipients of the letter gather from these words? They would understand the words in the light of the usage familiar to them throughout their life. Then those who believe (as I do) that Paul's expression was adapted to, and to a large extent determined by, the character and mind of his correspondents, will be slow to believe that he had no regard to the sense which their previous circumstances and education would lead them to take from his words.

The inscription of Metrophanes and Flavianus, just quoted, should be compared with that of Skollos and Tatias (see sec. viii.), which belongs to the following class and ends with a blessing: εὐλογεῖ Μητρὶ Ἀτίμιτι καὶ Μηνὶ Τιάμου.

V. Inscriptions of Confession.

By far the most common and noteworthy class of votive inscriptions is what may be called the *Confessions*. 'In the inscriptions of this class found at Dionysopolis, the authors are represented as having approached the temple, or engaged in the service of the deity, while polluted with some physical or moral impurity, and therefore unfit to appear before the god; they are chastized by the god, generally with some disease, sometimes through their property, or, perhaps, their children; they confess and acknowledge their fault; they appease the god by sacrifice and expiation, or by some gift or dedication; they are freed by the god from their chastisement; finally, they narrate the whole circumstances in a public inscription as a warning and an exemplar to all men not to treat the god lightly' (*C.B.*, p. 134 f.).

[1] The restoration is mine, and seems required by the sense and the spaces, though involving one of those awkward changes of person which are common in Anatolian inscriptions. In the inscription as published in *Athenische Mittheilungen*, vi. p. 273, no restoration is given. Buresch (*Aus Lydien*, p. 113) gives one which is quite unusual in form.

[2] I think little stress can be laid on Ewald's conjecture, making these eighteen workmen into debtors of the treasury.

In the Katakekaumene many examples of this class of inscriptions are found. In them the procedure is much the same. There is not the same stress laid on the fact that the authors approached the temple while impure; they are merely said to have committed some fault and been punished by the god.

Before discussing these inscriptions word by word, it is well to point out a parallel in the New Testament to the general thought in them. Remembering that the commonest form of punishment inflicted by the god was bodily disease, we must be struck with the inscription *C.B.* 43. The beginning of this text is unluckily lost; but the conclusion shows that the sin consisted in eating the flesh of the sacred unsacrificable goat; and the following explanation (given in my text, *C.B.*, p. 138) has been accepted by Professor Robertson Smith.[1] The goat was a sacred animal, and therefore forbidden to be used in the ordinary sacrifice (*θυσία*), the flesh of which was eaten by the worshippers; it might be offered only as the most solemn sacrifice, which was not eaten but given whole to the gods. The sin in this inscription lay in treating the goat as an ordinary sacrifice and eating the flesh; hence the warning, *παρανγέλλω μηθένα ἱερὸν ἄθυτον αἰγοτόμιον ἔσθειν.* The offerer of this sacrifice was punished with bodily illness. By purificatory ceremonies and sacrifices he propitiated the Lord, *καθαρμοῖς κὲ θυσίαις ε[ἱλασάμην τὸν Κ]ύριον ἵνα μυ* (*i.e.* *μοι*) *τὸ ἐμὸν σῶ[μα σώσ]ι* (*i.e.* *σώσῃ*); and the god restored him to his normal physical condition (*ἀποκαθέστησε [τῷ ἐμ]ῷ σώματι*). Anyone who commits a like sin is warned that he will suffer the same punishment (*παθῖτε τὰς ἐμὰς {ἐμὰς} κολάσεις*).

Another explanation, suggested by my friend Professor Paterson, takes the important words in the sense 'no one should eat the meat of the sacred animal, the goat, when it has not been offered in sacrifice'; there were animals which it was not permissible to eat, except on certain rare occasions, when they were offered as a specially solemn sacrifice. After the sacrifice 'the worshippers partake of the sacred flesh, which at other times it would be impious to touch.'[2] The objection which makes me shrink from adopting this suggestion is, that all animals of this class were unclean, as Robertson Smith points out, and were eaten only as an exceptional act in connexion with the solemn sacrifice. But a similar objection applies to my own explanation. It supposes that the goat was not allowed to be eaten at all. Does the inscription introduce us to a state of society in which people were beginning to rebel against the religious prohibition against eating the flesh of the goat (which seems to have been sacred, as its head is one of the hieroglyphic symbols in the ancient Anatolian or 'Hittite' system of writing)? though superstitious persons, after infringing the religious law by eating the goat, began sometimes to be troubled by scruples of conscience, and to fancy that any illness which subsequently occurred was a punishment for their impiety.

But the exact sense does not affect the aptness of the following remarkable parallel, for which I am indebted to Professor Paterson. In 1 Co 11[29. 30], Paul says, 'Whosoever shall eat the bread . . . of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty, *ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον . . . τοῦ Κυρίου, ἔνοχος ἔσται, ...* Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat. . . . For he that eateth . . . eateth . . . judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body, *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα.* For this cause many among you are weak and sickly (*ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄῤῥωστοι*), and not a few sleep (*i.e.* are dead).'

The thought here is strikingly close in form and character. They who commit a fault in the celebration of the most holy ceremonial act in the worship of the Lord are guilty, and suffer bodily punishment in the form of sickness and disease, and even death. The form of the denunciation is exactly that of hundreds of denunciations of divine wrath in the sepulchral and other inscriptions, *ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ, ἔνοχος ἔσται.* Compare, for example, *C.B.*, 40, *ὃς ἂν ἐπενκαλέσῃ, θήσει εἰς [τὸν θεὸν* or *φίσκον]*, and *C.B.*, p. 273, No. 193, *ἔνοχος ἔσται τυμβωρυχίᾳ.*

VI. The Sin.

The beginning of each incident described in this class of temple inscriptions is some fault, which caused guilt or impurity in the eyes of the god. In some cases the fault is described in detail, in other cases it is merely expressed in general terms by some part of the verb *ἁμαρτάνω.* Thus, at Dionysopolis, *C.B.*, No. 45, *βιαθ(ε)ῖσα ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ κὲ ἡμάρτησα*; *C.B.*, Nos. 48 and 49 (which are expressed in Greek

[1] I possess the letter in which he approved the explanation, based on his own teaching, which I had submitted to his judgment many years ago.

[2] Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 294.

so bad as to be almost or quite unintelligible[1] in many places), contain the phrases δὶ τὸ ἡμαρτηκείνει, δεὶ τὸ ἐμαρτηνκένει, which are apparently intended for διὰ τὸ ἡμαρτηκέναι. Instead of this phrase, in the Katakekaumene, when Ammias was punished after having spoken a sinful word, δι' ἁμαρτίαν λόγον λαλήσασα is the expression, showing that ἁμαρτία is exactly equivalent to τὸ ἡμαρτηκέναι. Again, 'when Phœbus sinned (ἡμάρτησεν), Great Artemis required of him an offering' in the Katakekaumene; and in *C.B.*, No. 51, ἡμάρ[τησεν or τηκεν] occurs at Dionysopolis.

The noun ἁμαρτία is rarely found in the inscriptions, but a second example occurs in the Laurian inscriptions of Xanthos: ἁμαρτίαν ὀφειλέτω (see sec. iii.).

The adjective ἁμαρτωλὸς occurs in another class of inscriptions, denouncing penalties against him who violates the terms of a will and sins against the gods who guard the rights of the grave: ἁμαρτωλὸς ἔστω θεῶν πάντων καὶ Λητοῦς καὶ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς (*C.I.G.*, 4259); ἁμαρτωλὸς ἔστω εἰς τὴν Λητὼ καὶ εἰς τοὺς λοιποὺς θεοὺς πάντας (*C.I.G.*, 4303).

Besides the simple words, παραμαρτάνειν is used in two inscriptions of the Katakekaumene in the sense of committing a fault against the right of the grave (Buresch, *Aus Lydien*, p. 116).

In outward form this use of ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτωλός, and ἁμαρτία closely resembles the use of these words in the New Testament, where they are very frequent. In inner meaning and life there is, of course, the most profound difference: the contrast between paganism and Christianity turns most of all on the conception of ἁμαρτία. A few cases taken from the New Testament will show at once the resemblance in form and the contrast in meaning.

Such ideas as those which suggested the questions—Jn 9^2, 'Who did sin, this man or his parents,[2] that he should be born blind?' τίς ἥμαρτεν οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ; Lk 13^4, 'Think you these Galileans were sinners, ἁμαρτωλοί, above all the Galileans because they have suffered πεπόνθασιν (a bloody death)'?—repeat exactly the thought and the language of the votive inscriptions: physical suffering or death is the result of sin against the god. In Lk 13^2, the verb πάσχω is used exactly as in the warning *C.B.*, No. 43, παθῖτε (*i.e.* παθεῖται, a false form of the future tense) τὰς ἐμὰς κολάσεις, 'Whoever sins as I have done will suffer my chastisement.' But the doctrine, common to the old Jews[3] and to the hieratic inscriptions of Asia Minor, is quoted by Christ in the above passages, only to be rejected.

Again, we find the construction, εἰς Χριστὸν ἁμαρτάνετε (1 Co 8^{12}), as the inscriptions say, ἁμαρτωλοὶ εἰς Λητῶ. In He 1^3, καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος; 2^{17}, ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας[4] τοῦ λαοῦ; 7^{27}, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν; 12^4, ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν, the resemblance in form to the inscriptions is very marked (ἱλάσκεσθαι is very common in them; and καθαρμός and θυσία occur and may, of course, be supposed in all cases, even where not expressly mentioned), but the difference in intention is really as complete as in 10^6, ὁλοκαυτώματα περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας, 'In whole burnt offerings for sin thou hadst no pleasure.'

To review some of the special sins, for which atonement has been demanded by the god, will better illustrate the character of the cultus. Metrodorus, Glykon's slave, broke, without intending it (ἀκούσιως), a little stele, the property of the god, who demanded its restitution (κατεάξας στηλλάριον, unpublished inscription). Stratonicus, in ignorance (κατ' ἄγνοιαν), cut from the grove the trees that belonged to Zeus and Artemis. Glykon raised his hands against his foster-mother (see sec. vi.). Hermogenes slandered Artemidorus as regards wine.

In an unfortunately defective inscription (*C.B.*, No. 42) Onesimos paid a vow to Apollo on behalf of his ox, which had been punished because Onesimos had failed in his duty and not presented himself (*i.e.* for the service of the god at the *hieron*), διὰ τὸ ὑσ[τερηκέν]ε[5] καὶ μὴ παραγεγον[ένε]. The meaning of the inscription requires some explanation. Evidently, Onesimos was bound to present himself at the temple of Apollo for some duty (comp. Jn 8^2, παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν; Ac 17^{10}, παραγενόμενοι εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν). Now there was no idea

[1] The form ἐξοπράρει[ον], *i.e.* ἐξονπλάριον, Latin *exemplar*, is a typical example of the corrupted language of these inscriptions.

[2] The old Jewish doctrine that the sin of the fathers is visited on the children, is exactly the teaching of the Asia Minor inscriptions (see sec. ix.).

[3] It has, of course, a long history, which we do not here enter upon.

[4] On this phrase see below (sec. xi.).

[5] Compare the phrase διὰ τὸ ἡμαρτηκέναι, quoted in an earlier part of this section.

in ancient paganism that ordinary persons ought to appear regularly for worship at the temple. Onesimos, therefore, must have occupied some position which entailed service in the temple on certain special occasions; and in one case he had failed to appear for this duty. In all probability he was one of the peculiar class called *hieroi* (probably a Hellenized form of an originally Asiatic institution, the *hierodouloi*), on whose position and duties see *C.B.*, pp. 135, 147, and authorities there quoted.

The use of ὑστερεῖν in this inscription is very characteristic of the New Testament,[1] *e.g.* He 4[1], μή ποτε δοκῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑστερηκέναι.

There is another class of inscriptions differing to some extent in character, but not always distinguishable from this, in which the god is represented, not as directly angry with the sin, but as helping the sufferer to whose loss the sin has been committed. The sufferer asks the god's help by invoking a curse on the wrong-doer, and the punishment which falls on the latter is not merely retribution for his faults, but also a favour granted to the prayer of the person whom he has injured. But even in such cases the wrong-doer can appease the god, and partly or wholly escape from the punishment. The god is represented as a judge, whose action has to be set in motion by a formal appeal before he intervenes to punish the guilty parties. Hence we find in one case the statement that the sufferer made way for the goddess and left his case to the goddess as his champion, παρεχώρησεν τῇ θεῷ, (see sec. viii.). In many others the appeal to the god may probably be understood as made at an early stage of the matter, even though it is not expressly mentioned.

The procedure is most explicitly and clearly stated in an inscription of the Katakekaumene (*C.I.G.*, 3442): 'When Hermogenes and (his wife?) Nitonis slandered Artemidorus regarding wine (ἐλοιδόρησαν περὶ οἴνου), Artemidorus dedicated a tablet—πιττάκιον ἔ[ξέ]δωκε[2] (*i.e.* making the god his avenger and champion). The god punished Hermogenes (ἐκολάσετο), and he propitiated the god (εἱλάσετο), and from henceforth (the god?) will be well pleased (ἀπὸ νῦν εὐδόξει).'[3]

[1] This parallel was pointed out to me by Professor Paterson.

[2] In Hamilton's copy the lacuna in ἐ[ξέ]δωκε is marked; but the older copies of Keppel and Prokesch have ἔδωκε only (*C.I.G.*, 3442).

[3] See Deissmann's note on the biblical use of ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, in the same way as here (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 80 f.).

In the concluding phrase it seems better to understand a rather harsh change of subject (such as is common in these inscriptions). The interpretation, 'Artemidorus will acquiesce and be content with the situation,' which is also possible, seems weak and unsuited to the tone of these inscriptions. If Artemidorus is the subject, it would be better to take an unusual sense, 'he will be wise,' or to read εὐδοξεῖ from εὐδοξέω, 'he is approved' (by the god), in the sense of Xenophon, *Hist. Gr.* i. 1, 30.

In the more superstitious view, it was actually assumed that the god could be moved by any person to punish his enemies, quite apart from any guilt on their part; the proper ceremonies would compel the god to act in the way sought. But this was rather a belief of superstition and ignorance, and it is probably not right, as some authorities do, to take this as part of the theory of paganism. It was a consequence to which the pagan theory of prayer accommodated itself too readily; but there is in these inscriptions no proof that the respectable priesthood at the great temples lent themselves to such practices, but rather a presumption that they discountenanced them, and inculcated the idea that the god was a just god. There was some idea that such curses were a secret and unfair method, part of magic rather than of the religion of the gods, and they were often buried so as to be hid from all but the gods.

A curious group of inscriptions of cursing was found at Cnidos, scratched on leaden tablets, which were fixed on the walls of the temple of Demeter and Persephone, or against the basement of larger monuments. They contain curses against thieves, slanderers, poisoners, assassins, users of false weights, persons who would not give back money entrusted to them on deposit, persons who found and did not restore lost articles, etc. The belief among the Cnidians was that Demeter sent on the culprits subterranean fire, which affected them in the form of fever, and burned them up and forced them to confess: πεπρημένη ἐξομολογοῦσα is said of one woman.[4] These all belong probably to the second or last century before Christ, and the native Anatolian and Oriental character in them is much affected by Greek feeling. Hence, as Dr. Wuensch remarks,[5]

[4] Compare the cases 1 Co 5[5] 11[30] quoted in sec. v., and lower down in the present section.

[5] *Corpus Inscr. Attic.*, Appendix.

they seem in some cases to fulfil the humble purpose of mere advertisement of lost articles. That such advertisement of lost property should take the form of a solemn curse on him that finds and restores not, shows to what an extraordinary degree the daily life and acts of the pagan world took a religious form. It was impossible for the Christian to live in ordinary society without being continually brought in contact with pagan ritual, for the very forms of common courtesy and politeness in social intercourse had a religious character. Hence the ordinary Christian was daily required to decide, in delicate cases, how far he should conform to, or protest against, pagan usages; and opinion, naturally and justifiably, varied very much as to what was right in such situations. A remarkable case, where this delicate problem seems to have been practically solved by a satisfactory compromise, until the experiment was ruthlessly destroyed by Diocletian with fire and sword, is described in *C. B.* pp. 502–509.

All the known inscription of the Katakekaumene were engraved on marble, and none on lead have yet been found, or are likely to be found, unless excavations, such as were made by Sir C. Newton at Cnidos, are instituted at the central *hieron* of the district.

The following inscription, however, approximates rather closely to the superstitious and magical view. In 156 A.D. Apollonius writes hereby, for destruction, παραγράφει,[1] τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ, him that struck the tablet and the aider and suggester.[2]

A curious and much mutilated inscription of the Katakekaumene should probably be restored so as to illustrate this subject: Θεοδότη Γλύκων[ι ἐπαρᾶτο] θρεπτῷ, ἐπ(ε)ιδὴ ἁράμ[ενος] τὰς χ(ε)ῖρας αὐτῇ ἐκα-[κώσα]το· κὲ ἀποθανούσης [Θεοδότης] κὲ τοῦ Γλύκωνος, ὁ θεὸς ἐπεζήτησε παρὰ [. . .] τοῦ ἐκγόνου αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀπέδωκε. καὶ ἀπὸ νῦν ε[ὐλογεῖ or ὐδόξει]:[3] Theodote invoked a curse on the foundling child Glykon, when he had lifted his hands against her and injured her; and after Theodote and Glykon had died, the god sought payment from her grandson (name lost), and he gave it, and from henceforth blesses the god. The death of Glykon is considered as an answer by the god to the imprecation invoked on him; and he therefore requires that payment be made for his fulfilling the prayer and vow which were involved in the curse. As Theodote, who had invoked the curse, is dead, the god demands payment from her grandson.

These appeals of the sufferers to the god recall the remarkable passage in 1 Co 5[5], where the Church is bid assemble and deliver the offender unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh[4]: παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκὸς. It cannot have been unknown to Paul that he was here using a form of words similar to the curses by which the Corinthians had formerly been accustomed to consign their personal enemies to destruction by the powers of the world of death. It seems not open to doubt that the Corinthians would understand by this phrase that the offender was to suffer disease and even death as a punishment for his sin; and Paul goes on to add that this punishment of the flesh is intended to bring salvation ultimately to his soul (ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ): by physical suffering he is to atone for his sin. In the parallel passage (1 Ti 1[20]) about Hymenæus and Alexander (οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν) the same intention is marked with equal emphasis. The whole thought stands in the closest relation to the theory of the confession-inscriptions, in which those who have been punished by the god thank and bless him for the chastisement.

That the Corinthians would understand the words of Paul in this way seems clear; and, moreover, when we compare the language of Paul in 11[30] about disease and death being the consequence of participating in the sacrament in wrong (*i.e.* impure) manner, as quoted above (sec. v.), it seems also clear that he intended the words to be taken in that sense.

The question that is most difficult to answer is as to the part to be played by Satan in this process, and how far he is conceived of as analogous to the gods to whom the pagans handed over their enemies for similar punishment. Here, it must be enough to put the question

[1] Perhaps παραγράφει means 'adds to the list,' *adscribit*, implying that the tablet was added to the others of the same purport at the *hieron*. Perhaps, however, it is equivalent to καταγράφει in the formula of cursing.

[2] Understanding that [δ]ιηρκό[τ]α καὶ ογcτορα are the attempt of an ignorant person to write the perf. part. act. accus. sing. of διαρκέω and the accus. of *auctor*.

[3] Published by M. Fontrier in *Smyrna Mouseion*, No φξθ′: he restores rightly ἐκακώσατο and Θεοδότης; but has ἀραμένης and αὐτὴ, makes Glykon the father instead of the foundling child of Theodote, and leaves θρεπτῷ without any government.

[4] Here again I am indebted to Professor Paterson for the analogy.

Requests and Replies.

I am teacher of the Young Men's Class at our mission, and we have been taking, recently, the International Lessons in the Second Book of Kings. In looking up the lesson, one of my young men came across the difficulty which I desire you to explain for me. According to 2 Kings xvi. 2, 20, king Ahaz died when thirty-six years old, and was succeeded by his son Hezekiah. We learn from 2 Kings xviii. 1, 2 that Hezekiah was twenty-five years old when he began to reign in the stead of his father Ahaz. From this it would appear that when Hezekiah was born, his father Ahaz was only eleven years old! Is there an explanation sufficient to appear reasonable to the mind of the average common-sense young man? Most expositors and commentators, when they meet with a difficulty like this, follow the example of the famous preacher who used to say, 'Brethren, let us look this difficulty straight in the face—*and pass on.*'—S. B.

A *possible* solution of the above difficulty is to read in 2 K 16^2 *twenty-five* instead of *twenty* as the age of Ahaz at his accession. 'Twenty-five' is actually the reading in one Hebrew MS., as well as in Lucian's recension of the Greek text, and in the Peshiṭta and Arabic versions of 2 Ch 28^1, the parallel passage to 2 K 16^2. This would make Ahaz's age at the birth of Hezekiah sixteen, if the latter was twenty-five years old when he came to the throne. Unfortunately, one cannot help suspecting that it may have been precisely in order to avoid a difficulty that the above authorities introduced a change into the text. The whole subject of the biblical chronology of the Books of Kings is beset with insoluble problems, and on the principle that 'Honesty is the best policy,' this should be frankly admitted in such cases as the one referred to by 'S. B.' There are certain dates fixed by the Assyrian Inscriptions, and with these the biblical chronology is by no means always in agreement. Now the 'average common-sense young man' will readily perceive that the Inscriptions are entitled to the preference, because they are contemporary with the events described, whereas the dates in Kings are frequently derived by the compiler, not from contemporary documents, but by computation according to a scheme of his own. The biblical chronology also deals largely in round numbers, like 'forty' and 'twenty,' without aiming at the exactness we should look for in a modern historian.

The answer to 'S. B.'s' question is somewhat connected with the answer to one of the most debated of all questions in biblical chronology: *the date of Hezekiah's accession.* We are told in 2 K $18^{10.13}$ that the Fall of Samaria took place in the sixth year, and the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib in the fourteenth year, of Hezekiah's reign. Now it happens that by the aid of the Inscriptions we can exactly date both these events: the first having occurred in 722 B.C., the second in 701; *i.e.* there was an interval between them of *twenty-one*, and not of *eight* years. It is possible that neither of the dates in Kings is precisely correct, but it is certain that they cannot both be so. Some accept the 'sixth year' of v.^{10} as correct, which gives 728 B.C. as the year of Hezekiah's accession, others reject this but accept the 'fourteenth year' of v.^{13}, which makes him come to the throne in 715. Amidst this uncertainty there is considerable scope for altering the biblical data regarding the respective ages of Ahaz and Hezekiah when they came to the throne. For instance, those scholars who adopt 728 as the date of Hezekiah's accession, sometimes reduce his age at that event from twenty-five to fifteen, while, as above, they lengthen that of Ahaz from twenty to twenty-five. We know with certainty that Ahaz was king in 735–34, during the campaign of Pekah and Rezin, which was followed by the invasion of Israel by Tiglath-pileser, and that Hezekiah occupied the throne in 702–701 when Sennacherib invaded Judah. Which of the two was king when Samaria fell (722 B.C.) must, with our present sources of information, remain uncertain. The whole subject is fully discussed in W. R. Smith's *Prophets of Israel*[1] (pp. 413–419). An excellent summary will be found in Driver's *Isaiah*[2] ('Men of the Bible' Series) pp. 12–14.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter.

Can any of your readers suggest why our Lord, when 'He descended into hell,' preached ONLY to the spirits of the men of the Deluge?—L. H.

This query proceeds upon the false assumption that the passage in 1 P (3^{18-20}) teaches that Christ, after His death, and previous to His resurrection, went, in His disembodied spirit, and preached to the disembodied spirits of those who had perished

in the waters of the Flood. Had this been the apostle's meaning, his words must have been very different from what they are. They would probably have been something like this: 'Christ was put to death, but, in His spirit which survived, He went and preached to the disembodied spirits of those whom the Flood drowned. This he did in the interval between His death and resurrection.' The words, however, which St. Peter has given us cannot be twisted into such a sense. The Greek words θανατωθεὶς and ζωοποιηθεὶς are contrasted, as the adversative δὲ indicates. The one expresses an idea the exactly opposite of the other. The former expresses the fact of Christ's death, the latter that of His resurrection. Our Revisers do not assist us to see this contrast, by translating ζωοποιηθεὶς by the ambiguous term *quickened* as did also their predecessors of 1611. The word means *restored to life* or *made alive*, and nothing else. The word *spirit* stands in a strange connexion, if the assumption of the querist has any truth in it. It occurs *after* the mention of our Lord's resurrection—His being restored to life, and not before it. What logical or grammatical ground is there, therefore, in the apostle's words, for saying that Christ in His disembodied state preached to disembodied spirits? If we make *spirit* the antecedent to *which* in v.[19], it follows that the preaching to the spirits in prison took place after our Lord's resurrection, and not before. But this construction of the relative, which is so persistently followed by interpreters, is plainly inadmissible.

Perhaps the best way to satisfy the querist would be to give what we regard as the correct rendering of the passage: 'Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God—put to death because of the flesh, but restored to life because of the spirit. Wherefore (literally, *in which*) He even went and preached to the spirits in prison, who were at the time disobedient, when the long-suffering of God was continuing to wait in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing, into which few, that is, eight souls, were brought safely through water. And this also is now saving you an antitype.' A glance at this translation shows that one great idea runs through the whole passage: Christ's desire to bring men to God. This desire led Him to resign Himself to death; it led Him even to go and preach to the antediluvians, then shut up, as in prison, under the doom of the coming deluge, unless they repented. This desire was also that which was working out the salvation of those to whom Peter wrote. We may add that the last part of v.[18], which is a double parenthetical clause, expresses the well-understood ethical relation between the death and resurrection of Christ and the mystical death and resurrection of the sinner at the time of conversion. The words 'flesh' and 'spirit' do not refer to Christ, but to the corrupt and the renewed natures of man. But we are occupying too much space. We have fully discussed the whole passage in a book just published by Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier of Edinburgh and London,—*The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and other Papers*,—to which we refer the querist for further satisfaction.

[It should perhaps be added that Bruston (*Descente du Christ aux Enfers*), who contends strongly for a preaching by Christ to the spirits in prison, *after*, not *before* His resurrection, explains the mention only of the rebellious at the time of the Deluge by taking the words καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν to mean '*even* to the spirits in prison.' By these he understands not the *human* contemporaries of Noah, but the *angels* of Gn 6[1-4], whose sin was specially heinous and whose doom (ἐν φυλακῇ) was correspondingly severe. All the spirits, *i.e.* to say, heard the good news, even the worst of them. (See The Expository Times, October 1897, pp. 21 f.).] A. Welch.

Edinburgh.

Bible Hospitality.[1]

By the Rev. James Wells, D.D., Glasgow.

Very fortunate is the Bible student who, travelling in Bible Lands, is the guest of the native chiefs in districts untouched by Western things. This good fortune was mine in the land of the Philistines, in the regions beyond Jordan, and in remote nooks in the highlands of Galilee. The customs there have probably not changed since the days of Abraham. As the traveller surveys an Arab tent encircled by ample flocks and herds, the partition walls of millenniums melt away, and he feels transported, as if by enchantment, into a world very unlike his own. He can easily fancy that the stately men around him are Abrahams, Jacobs, Esaus, and Jobs. This inner picture gallery is enriched by *tableaux vivants* of Bible scenes. And his gains are permanent; for *voir c'est avoir*. He finds the past in the present, and is delightfully excited as fresh light flashes again and again upon many a sacred page. He understands Bible incidents because he sees them.

Would the reader care to have a specimen of the exegetical value of such experiences?

The earliest account of ancient hospitality is in Gn 18^{1-8}. Let us lay alongside of it the hospitality of a modern Arab chief who has not yielded to Occidental influences. In this one matter, at least, the Arabs of to-day closely imitate their father Abraham.

As the mysterious strangers approached, Abraham 'ran to meet them from the tent door' (v.[2]). The sheikh's tent is still planted nearest the travelled way, and his tent door looks towards the quarter whence strangers approach. His tent is all door on that side. Job, the Rabbis say, had four doors in his tent, towards the four quarters, so that his guests might not have the trouble of going round. It is held disgraceful to encamp out of the way of travellers. At night the Arabs kindle watchfires and keep dogs to guide wayfarers to their tent. A hospitable man is called 'One whose dogs bark loudly.' The Arab dines at his tent door that he may invite the passers-by. Abraham sitting at his tent door, the Rabbis would assure us, was on the outlook for guests, and his love-quickened eye, like that of the father of the prodigal, saw them when they were yet a great way off. Millionaire though he was, with three hundred domestics, he ran—such was his joyous alacrity. One day our party approached the encampment of the richest chief on the east of the Jordan. A horseman at full gallop rode up to us and warmly invited us to visit his chief. In a minute or two the chief himself dashed forward in full dress. When there are more chiefs than one, they gallop as for a wager, and each strives to reach the stranger first and claim him as a guest. Often a chief seems beside himself with joy when heaven sends him guests. Many villages on the east of Jordan have guest-houses, where travellers are entertained at the expense of the village, so that all may share the supreme privilege of befriending strangers. Some of these guest-houses I have seen are the best in the village after the chief's house. Abraham 'bowed himself toward the ground.' That was no slender inclination of the head like ours, but an Oriental prostration. And he said, 'My Lord, if now I have found favour in Thy sight, pass not away, I pray Thee, from Thy servant.' Dr. Porter tells us that he has received the same invitation in almost the self-same words. The root-idea of Arab hospitality is that the guest is the lord and the chief his servant for the time being, and that the guest is bestowing a great favour upon the host. One chief article in the Arab's Creed runs thus, 'Every guest while in the house is its lord.' This principle is carried out to all its consequences. The most powerful chief we visited remained standing while we were entertained in his tent. That chief held before us the very image and mirror of Bible times, for v.[8] says, 'And he (Abraham) stood by them under the tree, and they did eat.' *They*, not he. The host to-day does not eat with his guests, as he esteems it meat and drink enough for him to see his guests regaled in his 'house of hair.' One exception to this rule is, that the host drinks the first cup of coffee to show that it is not poisoned—so says Burton. Not

[1] The best books on this subject are:—Trumbull's *Studies in Oriental Social Life*; Doughty's *Arabia Deserta*; Schumacher's *Across the Jordan*; Burckhardt's *Travels in Arabia*; Palmer's *The Desert of the Exodus*; Burton's *El Medina and Meccah*.

till we asked him to do so did our chief sit down: the tent was ours, and he our humble servant. Christ's rule applies here: the greatest among them is the servant of all. On approaching the tent we saw men and women running to and fro with the greatest haste. They were pitching a new tent for us on a green spot unsoiled by use, and they were furnishing the tent with gaily coloured quilts and cushions. Two stalwart men rushed up to each rider, lifted him off the saddle tenderly as nurses dismount a child, took off his boots, and literally bore him to the tent with a hand under each of his elbows, as if he were a home-coming invalid. This recalled such passages as Ps 91^{12}, 'And they (His angels) shall bear thee up in their hands.' And does it not help us to illumine such a passage as Lk 16^{22}, 'The beggar . . . was carried (not merely conducted, but literally carried off) by the angels into Abraham's bosom.'

Like Abraham, our chief did not eat with us. Like Abraham too, he would have washed our feet had we not been Westlanders. So highly was this item of hospitality esteemed among the ancient Egyptians, that their basins for footwashing were of solid gold. 'For therefore,' says Abraham (v.[5]), 'are ye come to your servant.' These words have more meaning than we may imagine. The Arabs to-day have a profound sense of the sacred obligations of hospitality. Into it they infuse all their religion. It is the one virtue that has survived their demoralization: the one uncorrupted part of their faith; and so far as it goes, it is perfect; one can scarcely imagine any refinement of hospitality which they do not possess. Yet this does not imply a high standard of virtue, for Palmer tells us that the ancient Arabs prided themselves upon three things—eloquence, hospitality, and plundering. Hence they glorify everything pertaining to this grace. Abraham's words, we can scarcely doubt, mean, 'Ye are sent by God, God has so ordered your journey as to give me the blessed opportunity of entertaining you, and this I esteem as the highest favour.' Under this idea even a dying chief has been known to welcome guests, and to conceal his dying agonies lest he should fail in the supreme grace of hospitality.

Here are some of the favourite texts of the modern Arabs—God is the Host of all and the Giver of all good: the host must act for and like God: every stranger is a guest of God the Generous and Bountiful: he is an invited guest: he has been sent by God, and is to be treated as God has treated the host: every tent is a guest-tent as soon as a stranger comes in sight: the host is God's representative, and must act for God, not for himself: God's guests in the desert welcome all whom God sends.

Their hospitality is thus a great religious function, and every feast begins with grace before meat: 'In the name of God the Compassionate and Merciful.' They praise the guest who offers no money. No other nation has ever risen to their wonderful conception of hospitality. Probably the ancient Romans came nearest them in this respect; for Jupiter was the patron of hospitality, and the host gave his parting guest a *tessera* or token, which bore the image of Jupiter, as a pledge of friendship. Sometimes it was broken in two and divided between host and guest.

Abraham (vv.[5. 6]) got Sarah to bake quickly cakes upon the hearth. And he ran unto the herd, and fetched a calf, tender and good, and gave it unto a young man; and he hasted to dress it. The Arabs are probably the most expeditious bakers and butchers in the world. An Arab takes two or three handfuls of meal, pours a little water upon it, lays the dough on the hot embers; and turns it, lifts it, and rubs off the adhering ashes with his hand. In a very few minutes his fresh baked cake is ready for eating. He has no girdle: all his baking is done on the hearthstone. An Arab likes to have a big heap of ashes at his door as a proof of his ample hospitality. The catching, fetching, killing, skinning, cooking, and serving of the calf would probably not take more than half an hour: it does not take more to-day. The voice said (Ac 10^{13}), 'Rise, Peter; kill, *and* eat'; as if the eating would begin immediately after the killing. A rich man, like Abraham, dived into his big herd for a calf; but the average Jewish farmer kept a calf ready for possible guests. The witch of Endor had such 'a fat calf in the house' (1 S 28^{24}), and she handled it in the style of Abraham's cook. In the Parable of the Prodigal Son, '*the* fatted calf' is mentioned thrice. As everybody knew it, the servants did not need any special directions.

The calf is served up with rice on a big tray, which is placed on a low stool; and all the guests recline in a circle around it, exactly as they did, we may believe, in the days of Abraham. The

phrase 'rest yourselves' in v.[4] is literally, 'rest yourselves by reclining on your elbow.' The Arab's definition of a good feast is 'a heap which cannot be leaped by a cat.'

The arrival of a guest diffuses sympathetic joy through an Arab's household. They never keep flesh over night: all must be eaten on the cooking day. After the guests have eaten, the remains are given to the women, children, and servants. Bread is still the staff of life with the Arabs. Their daily prayer is for daily bread. Very seldom do they taste flesh, and they are very fond of it. 'Ye have nourished your hearts,' says St. James (5[5]), 'as in a day of slaughter'—one of these rare days on which you have a *treat* of flesh. This adds meaning to such phrases as 'a feast of fat things,' and explains why flesh-eating and merry-making go together, as in the Parable of the Prodigal Son.

Most beautiful and touching are the fruits of biblical hospitality. One day we were accompanied by an armed horseman for several miles. At last he was asked if he did not mean to go back. 'No,' he replied; 'I cannot go back, you have been in Agil Agha's tent, and are his friends. I must answer to him with my life for your safety while you are on this side of the Jordan.' He remained with us five days, and did his utmost for us. In the same spirit the Mohammedans in Egypt convoy a guest home, and believe that every such step is a step in the ascent of paradise.

My first night in an Arab tent gave me some prized exegetical touches. I will hang some of them around the 121st Psalm — the traveller's psalm. As we arrived, the chief greeted us with a biblical benediction, 'Peace be unto you.' His flocks and herds were in an enclosure around his tents; and they kept watch by night as the shepherds of Bethlehem did. But his guests were the special care of the chief: the old laws of hospitality guaranteed our safety: he could not entrust to others the keeping of his guests. He made 'a wall of fire round about' us (Zec 2[5]); and, armed with his long rifle, he sat at our tent door all night. Whenever I awoke during the night I found him wide awake, and the shadows from the fire dancing upon his immovable features. The great difficulty in the East is to get night watchers who can keep awake. Four are usually assigned to an encampment, so that the two pairs may watch and sleep by turns. One traveller tells that he repeated David's trick and stole the rifles of his drowsy guards. I have read of a chief whose enemy by a clever trick became his guest. He gave him food and said, 'By this act I have pledged every drop of my blood that, while you are in my territory, no evil shall come to you. For that space of time we are brothers.' Arab hospitality implies 'Sanctuary.' But 'He that keepeth thee will not slumber. Behold, He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep. The Lord is thy Keeper.' The image here is that of a sleepless host who watches over his guests till break of day. The Arab host firmly believes that he must consider his sleeping guest before his own child, and that he must place his life between him and danger. The guest's safety is thus measured by the power of his host. Jehovah is thy Host and thy Keeper. Thou art in His tent, and hast all guest-rights and guest-privileges. His eternal power secures thy eternal weal. 'The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth, and even for evermore.'

Our host's farewell the next morning was, like most things about him, exquisitely biblical. May Allah enlarge you, may Allah make a plain path before you, he said.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

As already intimated, the subjects of study for the session 1898–99 are the First Book of Psalms (Psalms i.–xli.) and the First Epistle of St. Peter.

Those who desire to study one or both of these portions of Scripture between November 1898 and June 1899 are invited to send their name and address to the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. There is no fee or other obligation. The purpose of the Guild is to encourage systematic study of Holy Scripture as distinguished from the mere reading of it, and the conditions are made as simple as possible. The best commentary available should be used. There are excellent editions of both books in the 'Cambridge Bible for Colleges.' And if the member can study the Hebrew and Greek, he will know that Delitzsch's (Hodder & Stoughton) or Cheyne's *Psalms* (Kegan Paul) are scholarly and suggestive, while an edition of a portion of St. Peter by the late Professor Hort has just been published by Messrs. Macmillan.

Students are invited to send short papers as the result of their study. One at least of these papers will be published every month. And the writers will be asked at the end of the year to select a volume out of a list which Messrs. T. & T. Clark will furnish.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Holzinger's 'Genesis.'[1]

THE Genesis in this series has been wisely entrusted to Holzinger, the author of the well-known critical work on the Hexateuch. The author's studies for that work had naturally prepared him for writing the present one, which is characterized by the same learning and thoroughness as the earlier book. The commentary is preceded by an Introduction devoted to some necessary preliminary questions, *e.g.* to the history of the criticism of Genesis, of which a very intelligent sketch is given. This is followed by a characterization of the various writers united in Genesis, J, E, and P, their standpoints, purpose in writing, and religious conceptions. This characterization is on the same lines with that in the author's Hexateuch, though more succinct, and is well worth reading. Holzinger decides that J is the oldest source. It is admitted by all scholars that this source received its final form in Judah, though some think that it originated in the northern kingdom, but Holzinger is of opinion that it is exclusively Judæan. This conclusion is important. It is often represented that what may be called the Prophetic Religion of Israel appears earlier in the northern kingdom than in Judah, and that it passed, or at least the impulses to it passed, from the one to the other. This is in itself improbable. The political and social history of Israel was marked by more violent movements than that of Judah, and these movements brought great prophetic personages like Elijah to the front, and we hear more of prophets in the north; but if writers like J appeared in Judah, say 100 years more or less before Isaiah, it must be admitted that the Prophetic Religion was not less advanced in Judah than in Israel, though, owing to the calmer atmosphere of Judæan life, its growth or history comes less into prominence in the public annals. The last section of the author's Introduction contains his account of the processes by which the various sources were united together in one work. A useful conspectus of the elements belonging to the respective sources, and those due to editorial or later hands, is added.

The commentary in the earlier chapters of Genesis is very full, though briefer in the later part. The author has adopted a method of exhibiting the contents of the book which, though it is difficult to carry through in some cases, conduces to historical clearness, and reveals whatever difference there may be in religious view or other

[1] *Genesis erklärt.* Von H. Holzinger ('Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A.T.'). Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr. 1898. Price 6s.

things in the different sources. Instead of treating the composite history of the Flood, for example, as it now stands, he disentangles the two threads of which it is woven, and treats them separately, giving first 'the Flood according to P,' and then 'the Flood according to J.' In a similar way he treats separately the Creation narratives, the primitive history, the Covenant with Abraham, and the like. This method of treatment reveals more clearly the lacunæ in one of the narratives, and suggests that to avoid duplicates some portions have been omitted when the narratives were united together. The first eleven chapters of Genesis contain what may be called the Primitive History of Mankind down to the call of Abraham. In these chapters, therefore, many forms of thought and religious ideas are met with common to a wide circle of peoples, and Israelitish only in a remoter degree; while in the chapters following, the ideas are more peculiarly those of Israel. The early chapters are necessarily traditional and fragmentary. The questions that arise in regard to their contents are such as these: First, what elements in the narrative belong to the historical tradition which the writer of Genesis found, and whence came the elements, from Babylon, or Phenicia, or Canaan, or elsewhere, and at what time? It is now evident that ideas which Israel may have come in contact with in Canaan may be Babylonian in origin. Second, with what ideas of the Prophetic Religion has the Hebrew writer informed or animated the historical tradition, necessitating the lopping off, or modification of much belonging to the original pagan form of the story? Comparison of the Bible histories of the Creation and Flood, with the forms such histories have in the Babylonian mythologies, shows how profoundly under the hand of the Hebrew writer the stories were subdued to the ideas of the Jehovah religion. A third question, and one to which the student of the religion of Israel would above all desire an answer, is this: How far did this saturation of primitive Semitic traditions with the ideas of the Prophetic Religion originate with particular individual writers such as J, or to what extent had the process of transformation already taken place in the general religious mind of the people of Israel? After his exposition of the various sections on Creation, the Flood, the Fall, and the like, Holzinger discusses the general questions raised by them with great fulness. His discussion is fair and reasonable, with full knowledge of what has been said by others, and is always instructive. Of course, where there is room for so much difference of opinion, his readers will not always agree with him. His explanation of Gn 4—the fratricide of Cain—will be thought superficial. He regards the passage as a myth, designed to explain the existence of Nomads and their outcast condition. Cain is the Kenites, and the Kenites are the Nomads; the murder is a mere imagination, invented to account for the fugitive and vagabond condition of the Bedouin. Such an explanation makes the whole story full of contradictions. What can be meant by the statement that Cain was a 'tiller of the ground'? Did the Hebrew writer suppose that nomadic tribes had been originally agriculturists? The identification of the Kenites with the pure Nomads is inconsistent with the reputation the Kenites had in Hebrew history. Holzinger supposes the 'sign' given to Cain to have been something indicative of the religion of Jehovah, to which the Kenites attached themselves. But how then could Cain say that he was driven from the presence of Jehovah? The puerile and the ingenious are so allied to one another that one doubts whether ingeniousness be not a greater foe to exegesis than stupidity. The history of the Fall given by J, though sombre and in a sense pessimistic, is so profound that one cannot believe that Holzinger and Stade have been successful in reading his meaning in chap. 4. Holzinger's work is scholarly and suggestive,—though the suggestions both in textual and historical criticism will sometimes be thought over-ingenious and unnecessary,—and will keep up the reputation of the very vigorous series of manuals to which it belongs.

A. B. Davidson.

Edinburgh.

The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus.[1]

The recent discovery of a portion of the original Hebrew text of Sirach created an interest that increased in intensity as it spread more widely. Besides the value of the discovery for the knowledge of Sirach itself, there was the grand question of the Hebrew of its day. If Ecclesiasticus was

[1] *L'Ecclésiastique: Texte Original Hebreu.* Édité, traduit, et commenté par Israel Lévi. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

written in new Hebrew, as many indications seemed to point, then Ecclesiastes was a much older book than criticism allowed. The answer of the new discovery was unmistakable. Its Hebrew, though mixed with some new words and idioms, is classical Hebrew.

In process of time the Rev. A. E. Cowley, M.A., and Ad. Neubauer, M.A., published an edition of the discovered text, and followed it up with an English translation. The edition before us is, however, the fullest and most satisfactory edition yet issued. It gives the Hebrew, and on the opposite page a translation in French. It annotates both Hebrew and French, and illustrates both from every literary source, and it discusses all the problems that have arisen or can arise, in a long delightful Introduction. It is, in short, the standard edition, and can only be replaced by one that covers more Hebrew. This, as we know, gives us from 39^{15} to 49^{11}.

As examples of what the discovery has done for Ecclesiasticus and what Dr. Lévi has done for the discovery, take two short passages.

In Sir 41^{3} R.V., translating the Greek, renders—

> Fear not the sentence of death;
> Remember them that have been before thee, and that come after.

Cowley and Neubauer, translating the Hebrew, read—

> Be not afraid of death, (which is) thy sentence,
> Remember that they which went before and they which come after (will be) with thee.

With this Lévi agrees, but he is able to be more terse and literal—

> Ne t'effraie pas de la mort, qui est ta loi;
> Souviens-toi que devanciers et successeurs [Heb. ראשנים ואחרנ(ים)] seront avec toi.

But in 43^{2} Lévi improves on Cowley and Neubauer considerably, and seems to us to hit the mark—

> R.V.—The sun when he appeareth, bringing tidings as he goeth forth,
> Is a marvellous instrument, the work of the Most High.
>
> C. and N.—The sun, when he goeth forth, poureth out warmth;
> How terrible are the works of the Lord!
>
> L.—Le soleil, à son aurore, resplendissant, proclame:
> 'Combien est admirable l'œuvre divine!'

The volume belongs to the *Bibliothèque de l'école des Hautes Études.* EDITOR.

Strack's 'Introduction to the Old Testament.'[1]

THE fourth edition of this compact and very useful *Introduction* came out in 1895, and has already been followed by this the fifth; it is not to be wondered at that another edition has been demanded; the wonder is, that it has not been translated into English, in which case there would be a considerable demand for it.

The new edition has thirteen pages more than the previous one. It has been thoroughly brought up to date, especially in the literary department. Books published since 1895, such as Moore's *Judges*, Dillmann's *Old Testament Theology*, and the English edition of Dillmann's *Genesis*, are referred to, while books which ought not to have been omitted in former editions are now included, such as Henderson's Commentaries on Isaiah, etc.

I have once more to complain that some indication is not given of the comparative value of books dealing with the same subject. It is the chronological order that is followed. It would be better to arrange the books in order of merit, and in addition to that to put them into two classes, namely, Works for Students and Scholars, and Popular Works. A few words here and there setting forth the aim and worth of the book would be a considerable advantage to those whose time for reading is limited, and Dr. Strack's book is intended for them. This need is supplied in a very few cases. But it must be admitted by everyone that no such complete list of books dealing with the Old Testament is to be found in English or in German, or indeed in any other language. It is quite amazing to see how complete his account of English works is; the Bibliography alone is well worth the price charged for the volume. I have noticed only one typographical error, and that is on p. 59, where we find 'Bundes-Auch' for 'Bundesbuch.' This mistake does not occur in the fourth edition. I take the liberty of suggesting to the industrious and learned author the advisability of adding an index to the volume. That would cost a good deal of labour,

[1] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament einschlusslich Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen.* Mit eingehender Angabe der Litteratur von D. Hermann L. Strack, ao. Professor der Theologie an der Universität, Berlin. Price M. 3.50 (3s. 6d.).

where so many names and matters are to be embraced, but it would be a great advantage to the reader.

Unlike the valuable *Introduction* by Canon Driver, Dr. Strack's work embraces General as well as Particular Introduction. In the general part our author writes succinctly of the Old Testament Canon, the history of the text and of the editions of the Hebrew Bible, of the Versions of the Old Testament, etc. Since he gives in most cases the principal opinions which have been held, the work is valuable as a means of information and also as a help in coming to a conclusion.

It is to be noted, further, that this *Introduction* embraces the Apocrypha as well as the Old Testament, and indeed the pseudepigraphical writings too; this shows how comprehensive the treatise is.

The chief merit of the book is that it contains the result of very wide reading brought into a small compass, and put into a very readable form. If anyone is inclined to follow up the study of any particular matter that is discussed, the best books are recommended him, and the chief courses of thinking pointed out. Take, for example, the section on the history of Pentateuch Criticism, what could be neater? Beginning with what the Talmud and other Jewish writings have taught, Dr. Strack passes on quickly to the modern period, when, with the French physician, Astruc, the real science of Pentateuch criticism began. The short descriptions of the point of view taken by the chief authorities are excellent, such as, that Vatke and J. F. L. George approached the subject in a philosophical way, applying the Hegelian principles; and that Reuss was chiefly prompted in his discussions by the silence of the historical book regarding the P legislation; that Graf popularized the position taken by his teacher, etc. Then there is a brief chapter on the dates and character of the chief documents as these are set forth by the principal authorities of recent times, such as Schrader, Dillmann, Wellhausen, and Cornill. The amount of reading which is compressed into these chapters is immense. Indeed, Dr. Strack is so bent upon telling the reader what other people have thought that he has hardly time to say what he himself thinks, which reminds me of a similar difficulty which professors of theology often have. When they have to teach too many subjects, or have not time to study the subject which they do teach, it is often the case that they have hurriedly to bring together the opinions of others without having leisure to give and vindicate their own. A pupil of the late Dr. M'Cosh of Princeton told me that in the Logic class conducted by Dr. M'Cosh during his Belfast days, after the teacher had given almost everybody else's opinion but his own, the students often shouted out, 'What does Jamie think?' And so in reading the volume before us, one is often moved to ask What does Dr. Strack think? Remembering, however, the limitations and the object of the book, it could not well be otherwise in this respect than it is.

It may be advisable at this stage to give a brief account of Dr. Strack's own position on certain matters of importance, for he *does* give and defend his opinions here and there. Dr. Strack denies of course that Moses is the author of our Pentateuch, and gives abundant reasons for his denial. He admits that the so-called five books of Moses are made up of parts taken from different documents, edited and re-edited in later times. E, he says, makes large use of the Book of the Covenant. At an early date, E and J were united. P existed before D, and therefore long before the Exile. In this last respect it will be seen that he agrees with Ewald and Dillmann, as against the later and now generally accepted opinion that P is post-exilic. J, E, and P were united at an early period. D, he holds, was not written in the time of Josiah, but belongs to a previous time. From his parrying the argument of W. Robertson Smith and of most moderns that Is 19^{19} must have been written before D, which condemns the use of *mazzeboth*,[1] one would gather that Dr. Strack puts D farther back in date than the real Isaiah. The argument for the prior date of Isaiah is an uncertain one, as the prophets use symbolical language (compare Mal 1^{11}, and Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy* throughout). But Dr. Strack's early dating of D is opposed to the opinions of most modern scholars, and, details apart, the state of opinion and of religious life implied in the book require a date sometime in the seventh century B.C. In his endeavour to show the early date of P, Dr. Strack appears to me to lay too much stress on mere details, on stray allusions, and on rare uses of words. What if P shows here and there signs of a pre-exilic date,

[1] 'In that day there shall be an altar to Yahwe in the land of Egypt, and a pillar (מַצֵּבָה) by its border to Yahwe.'

or even of the time and authorship of Moses himself?

Who denies this? Wellhausen does not. The late W. Robertson Smith did not. The latter held that the principle underlying the priestly legislation could be traced back to the days of Moses and even to Moses himself. See *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed. p. 313. The question to ask is, To what period in the history of Israel does the legislation identified with P belong? Does it, in all its details, go back to the time of Moses, or to any time before the Exile? Was our existing Pentateuch or rather the priestly part of it written before the Exile? A negative answer to these questions may be given, and is given, by men who acknowledge that many parts of P belong to a period long prior to the Exile, and even to Moses himself. It is just in this particular point that Professor James Robertson, in his able and well-written book, *The Early Religion of Israel*, goes astray.

Isaiah is not, according to Dr. Strack, the author of the whole of the first thirty-nine chapters of the book called by his name. Chaps. 36–39 are certainly not by him, and it is doubtful whether chaps. 13 and 14 are, although chap. 13 may be. Reasons are given—the old ones of course, at least they are old now—for believing that Isaiah did not and could not write the last twenty-six chapters of the book. Whether chaps. 56–66 are by a fresh writer, as Duhm holds, or by a syndicate of writers belonging to the Deutero-Isaiah school, as Canon Cheyne maintains, Dr. Strack leaves undecided. The early date of Joel is claimed, the reign of Joash being regarded as the time of its writing. Zechariah is the author only of the first eight chapters of the book so called. Daniel is a product of the second century B.C., of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Jonah is not to be taken as giving real history; its great purpose is to bring out the truth of the universal love of God which embraces heathen like the people of Nineveh, as well as Jews. Like the author of the Book of Job, so the author of this book had probably a basis of fact to work upon, but the purpose of these books as well as of the Book of Daniel is didactic and not historical.

One has to be careful at times in reading Dr. Strack's description of what those who differ from him teach. It is proverbially difficult to state quite fairly the case of an opponent. Wellhausen's attitude in regard to P's account of the Tabernacle (Ex 25^{31} and 41^{48}) is not quite correctly indicated by our author, who makes him to say that P's description of the Tabernacle was due to his fancy, pure and simple. I think those who have read Wellhausen's account of the matter would not have that impression. P's Tabernacle, when it differs from the First Temple, agrees with the Second, and also with the Temple of Ezekiel, as in the number of golden lampstands, and in the possession of inner and outer courts. The priestly writer, or rather writers, living amid the religious conceptions and practices of the post-exilic period, picture the wilderness life, with Moses in the centre, as enjoying in perfection the form of religion known in the time of the writers. The fancy was really controlled by the actual events amidst which they lived. The picture is no more fanciful than those of the perfect time of the Messiah which Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, etc., draw. In each case the writers could only see the ideal, whether past or future, in colours and in forms suggested by the life amidst which they lived.

The fact that careful, conservative, and devout scholars, like Dr. Strack, have advanced so far in the acceptance of critical opinions so-called of the Old Testament, is interesting and instructive. Indeed, such views are now almost orthodox, though less than forty years ago the late laborious and estimable Dr. Samuel Davidson lost his chair at the Lancashire College for advocating them. *Tempora mutantur.* God, however, and the truth remain the same, only they become more precious to us as the years go by.

T. Witton Davies.

Bangor Baptist College, North Wales.

Among the Periodicals.

Nero and the 'Beast' of the Apocalypse.

In the September number of the *Revue de Théologie*, Professor C. Bruston returns to the discussion of the above question. His own views on the apocalyptic 'Beast' have been already presented to our readers (see The Expository Times, January 1897, p. 168), and he vindicates these in the article before us, in opposition to the

explanation offered by Bousset in his *Offenbarung Johannis, neu bearbeitet* (in Meyer's Commentary). Regarding this work as a whole, Bruston uses the language of panegyric. He agrees, too, with its author and with the majority of recent commentators in holding that the principal object of the Apocalypse is to predict the fall of the Roman Empire, and thus to console the persecuted saints. Bruston and Bousset are also in accord in ascribing the book not to a single author or a single epoch.

But on one point of capital importance our two authors differ. Bruston considers that the hypothesis of *Nero redivivus*, particularly in the form adopted by Bousset, is exposed to insuperable objections as an explanation of the language of Rev 13^3, 'And I saw one of his heads as though it had been smitten unto death (ὡς ἐσφαγμένην εἰς θάνατον), and his (αὐτοῦ, not αὐτῆς, *sc.* the beast's not the head's) death-stroke was healed, and the whole earth wondered after the beast.' The interpretation generally offered of the seven heads of the Beast is that the Beast is the Roman Empire and the seven heads the first seven emperors, and thus far Bruston agrees. Bousset, however, holds that the first Roman emperors are represented not by the seven heads without crowns, but by the ten crowned horns, remarking, strangely enough, as Bruston thinks, that the seven heads have lost all significance, having been simply borrowed from tradition. To return to the interpretation of Rev 13^3. It is very often alleged that the head wounded to death is Nero, who, according to a widely spread (?) belief, was not really dead but concealed in Parthia, from which he was to return to exercise greater sway than ever. Bruston points out, however, that there is no word in the above text of the healing of the *head* (the murdered emperor) but of the *beast* (the empire wounded by this murder). Upon the peculiar view taken by Bousset of the seven heads and the ten horns, it is all the more difficult, as Bruston remarks, to find in the wounding and the cure of one of the seven heads any relation to the death and the future (imaginary) return of Nero, which, all the same, Bousset finds referred to in Rev 13^3. 'It is surprising that one of the *seven uncrowned heads* should represent one of the *ten emperors* already symbolized by the *ten crowned horns*.' Bruston considers that with all his skill, Bousset has been unable to extricate himself from the difficulties in which his peculiar interpretation has involved him, and that the common view of the partisans of the *Nero redivivus* hypothesis is right, that the author of the Apocalypse speaks of only *seven* emperors, not *ten*. 'They (the seven heads) are seven kings; the five (first) are fallen; the one (the sixth) is; the other (the seventh) is not yet come' (Rev 17^{10}). The representation here is perfectly clear, and Bruston argues that it is impossible to interpret differently the language of chap. 13.

The author of the Apocalypse then refers to only seven emperors, and he himself lived under the sixth. *But who is the sixth?* Are we to reckon Julius Cæsar or Augustus as the first Roman emperor? The partisans of the *Nero redivivus* hypothesis say Augustus, and then the sixth is Galba, or Vespasian, if one leaves out of account the three usurpers—Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. Bruston, on the contrary, starts with Julius Cæsar, the founder of the empire, and then the sixth emperor is Nero, under whom (towards the end of his reign, after the great persecution of 64 A.D.) the author of the Apocalypse wrote. He argues that Bousset can least of all, upon his theory of the seven heads and the ten horns, postulate that Nero is symbolized by the head wounded to death. Further, any argument he offers to prove that Nero was dead when the Apocalypse was written, is declared to involve a *petitio principii*. And as to the other partisans of the Nero hypothesis, Bruston argues, as we have seen above, and as has been maintained also by Düsterdieck and B. Weiss, that the wounding in Rev 13^3 is of the *Empire* and not of the *Emperor*. In short, as our readers are aware, he holds that the wounding to death of one of the heads refers to *the assassination of Julius Cæsar*, and the healing of the wound thus inflicted upon the Beast to the *reconstitution of the empire by Augustus*. He finds no force in Bousset's objection that upon this theory the '*as it were* wounded' (ὡς ἐσφαγμένην) is unintelligible. Why, it is neither more nor less intelligible than the same expression applied in 5^6 to Jesus, 'a lamb as though it had been slain' (ὡς ἐσφαγμένον). Both Jesus Christ and Julius Cæsar were *really* slain, but in the *vision* of the Apocalyptist they *appear* (ὡς) so.

Upon the whole, Bruston is inclined to think that Bousset, had he intended it, could hardly have produced a more convincing proof that the

Nero redivivus hypothesis is unworkable in the interpretation of the Apocalypse.

The Sumerian Question.

Readers of the new *Dictionary of the Bible* may have noted that the article 'Accad,' written by Professor Ira M. Price, contains some views that are out of harmony with those of Assyriologists like Hommel (cf., *e.g.*, the articles on 'Assyria' and 'Babylonia' in the same work). The divergence, indeed, was felt to be such as to call for an editorial note explaining the position of the controversy. Professor Price more than insinuates in his article that the so-called 'Sumerians' and 'Accadians' are but 'figments of an over-zealous scientific spirit,' and that the Semites invented the cuneiform characters instead of taking these over from the 'Sumerians.' Now it so happens that a work, entitled *Die Sumerische Frage*, by F. H. Weissbach, has been published this year (Leipzig: Hinrichs. Price M. 10), of which a review by Dr. A. Jeremias appears in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* for 17th September last. The book contains, first of all, an exhaustive history of the Sumerian question, from its commencement in 1850 down to the present day. Weissbach is pronounced by Jeremias to have thereby rendered invaluable service to Assyriologists now and in time to come, for without this sketch it would take much time and trouble to gather a thorough acquaintance with the complicated history of the important problem —important alike for the history of the world, of religion, and of civilization.

Hitherto, says Jeremias, the problem has been examined almost exclusively from the philological view-point. Is the so-called Sumerian an Assyrian secret character (or artificial language), or is it the natural speech of a non-Semitic Babylonian primitive people? As is well known, the Jewish scholar, Joseph Halévy, who may be called the father of anti-Sumerianism, has since 1874 strenuously denied the existence of a non-Semitic primitive people and a Sumerian language. Weissbach, on the other hand, expresses the firm conviction that the Sumerian question has ceased on the two main points to be a question; that is to say, he believes that the cuneiform characters were the invention of a non-Semitic people, and that they are rightly designated 'Sumerian.' Jeremias is unable to assent to the verdict in this categorical form. He points out that it has been unfortunate for the treatment of the problem from the first that the chief representative of anti-Sumerianism has been unable to conceal the philo-Semitic tendency of his investigations. For Halévy it is a point of honour that the Jews should have the credit of inventing the art of writing, and this although a co-religionist has reminded him that such a claim might be waived, seeing that the world owes to the Semites a still greater discovery, that of monotheism. Yet Jeremias thinks that a justifiable aversion to the 'tendency' of Halévy's researches has perhaps made Weissbach somewhat blind to the real merits of the great anti-Sumerist. (For instances see the *Theol. Literaturzeitung.*) Jeremias points out quite candidly the linguistic objections to the anti-Sumerian position, but, on the other hand, remarks that the existence of a primitive Sumerian people would occasion one of the riddles of history. How is it conceivable, he asks, that the Babylonian civilization, which dominates the whole of Western Asia as far back as our information reaches, and which possesses such an original power as completely to absorb the civilization of conquering races like the Kossæans, Elamites, Chaldæans, and Assyrians, and such an invincible power that after an existence of many years it could still impress its traces deeply on Western civilization, how is it conceivable that this civilization should be of a secondary character?

This leads Jeremias to examine the historical evidence. It is generally admitted that we have no 'pure Sumerian' text in the Babylonian literature hitherto discovered, not even in the Telloh tablets, which in part are even older than the newly discovered Nippur texts, and on which such hopes of a solution of the Sumerian problem were once placed. Everywhere it must be conceded that we find at least 'Semitisms', *i.e.* the inscriptions belong to an epoch when the supposed invasion of the Semites and the adoption of the old Sumerian civilization by Semitic Babylonians had already taken place, and they are all written by Semites. We are told that the pure Sumerian civilization, including the invention of writing, goes much farther back. But, asks Jeremias, do not the oldest Babylonian discoveries awaken partly the impression that we are face to face with almost the beginnings of human writing? And must one yet assume that already the bloom of pure Sumerian civilization was left so far behind that the memory of the non-Semitic primitive

people was lost? Not a trace of literary evidence for the Sumerians from pre-Assyrian times,—the memory of this far-advanced highly cultured people, to which one owes everything, had vanished from history! And where are the traces of the famed Sumerian culture? If they were the inventors of writing, what had they to write in their forgotten antiquity? No sufficient evidence is present, according to Jeremias, for attributing to them the ancient epics, the statue-heads of Telloh, or the ancient mythology.

Weissbach and Jeremias thus differ materially as to the present position of the Sumerian question. The former considers it to be solved, and only laments that our knowledge of Sumerian is still so meagre. The other thinks it is still far from solved, and does not expect it ever will be solved by purely philological methods, but he trusts that as the deciphering of the cuneiform characters has been the crowning achievement of the nineteenth century, it may be reserved for the twentieth century to find a satisfying answer to the great Sumerian question.

The 'Theologischer Jahresbericht.'[1]

The second and third *Abtheilungen* of this year's issue have appeared since we last noticed the above-named invaluable record of theological literature.

The second *Abtheilung* has for its subject *Historische Theologie*. It includes (1) Church History down to the Council of Nicæa — by Lüdemann; (2) from the Council of Nicæa to the Middle Ages, including the Byzantine literature —by Krüger; (3) Church History of the Middle Ages, exclusive of the Byzantine literature—by Ficker; (4) from the beginning of the Reformation to 1648—by Lœsche; (5) from 1648 down to the present day—by Hegler. All this is followed by two interesting and exhaustive sections on Inter-confessional Theology (by Kohlschmidt) and the History of Religion (by Professor Tiele of Leiden).

The third *Abtheilung* is devoted to *Systematische Theologie*, and is distributed amongst Meyer (who deals with *Encyclopädie*, *Apologetik*, *Kosmologie*, etc.), Trœltsch (*Religionsphilosophie und principielle Theologie*), Sulze (*Dogmatik*), Dreyer (*Ethik*). As is always the case with this indispensable work, not only is the literature carefully catalogued, but an astonishing amount of information about, and criticism of, the contents of the various books is compressed into small compass.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

[1] Berlin and Braunschweig: Schwetschke & Sohn; Edinburgh and London: Williams & Norgate.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

Genesis i. 26, 27.

'And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God created man in His own image: in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.'

Exposition.

'Let us make man.'—As the last and highest of the animate creatures, man is created. His creation is indeed thrown together with that of the land animals into one day, and in this way a certain connexion between the two is acknowledged. But much more does the account aim at making prominent his dissimilarity and his high dignity, as contrasted with these and all other beings. This is indicated by the place assigned him at the end of the whole series, and it is expressly stated by the assertion of his divine likeness and rank as ruler. Even in the introductory formula the importance of this last act is emphasised, since it does not continue as before: 'And God spake, Let man come into being,' but his creation is represented as the result of a special decision by God.—Dillmann.

'Man.'—*Man* (Heb. *adam*), the genus *homo*, the race as such, not the individual man, as is plain from the plural which follows, 'let them have dominion,' and again in the next verse: 'So God created man in His own image: in the image of God created He *him*; male and female created He *them*.'—Perowne.

'In our image.'—The idea of man is expressed in the statement that he is created in the image of God. This divine image is propagated. The dignity of the divine image is a second time ascribed to man (9^6), from which it

is clear that the divine image lies inalienably in man's being. The divine image is not twofold in the sense that a distinction is to be made between *image* and *likeness*; as, for example, Justin Martyr and Irenæus referred the first to the bodily form, and the second to the spirit; or the Alexandrian Fathers proposed to understand *image* of the rational basis of man's nature, and *likeness* of its free development to perfection.—OEHLER.

'After our likeness.'—*According to our likeness* expresses the same meaning, only more abstractly, and is not intended to weaken *image*, but in a cumulative way to make it more expressly prominent.—DILLMANN.

As to what in man constituted the *imago Dei*, the Reformed theologians commonly held it to have consisted (1) in the spirituality of his being, as an intelligent and free agent; (2) in the moral integrity and holiness of his nature; and (3) in his dominion over the creatures. In this connection the profound thought of Maimonides, elaborated by Tayler Lewis, should not be overlooked, that *tselem* is the specific, as opposed to the architectural, form of a thing; that which inwardly makes a thing what it is, as opposed to that external configuration which it actually possesses. It corresponds to the *min* or kind which determines species among animals. It is that which constitutes the genus *homo*.—WHITELAW.

'And God created man.'—The outburst of joy in the thought of man's creation, and high destiny and sovereign power, the crown on his head, and the sceptre in his hand, and royalty on his brow, in his look, and in his gait, finds expression in rhythmic cadence. The language falls into a triplet, with the repetition characteristic of Hebrew poetry, though what we have here is not formal poetry, but the involuntary, spontaneous poetry of exalted religious feeling.

Compare the similar statement in chap. $5^{1.\ 2}$, where the Elohistic writer resumes his narrative—

> 'In the day that God created man,
> In the likeness of God made He him;
> Male and female created He them.'

We experience a trembling joy at these words; the three propositions are like a tripudium, *i.e.* a dance of victory of three measures. What is related in more detail in the Jahvistic narrative is here comprised in a few winged words: God created man, and that with difference of sexes.—DELITZSCH.

'Male and female created He them.'—*A male and a female He created them*—not, 'Male and female did He create them,' as if the numbers of pairs were here left undetermined, for male and female are not collective, and that the author assumed only one pair is evident from chap. $5^{1ff.}$. The question whether mankind comes from one or from several pairs, although the subject of lively discussion in modern science, as yet, however, unsolved, and scientifically scarcely soluble at all, did not lie as a matter of controversy before the peoples of antiquity. Nor does our author make his statement in the form of an antithesis to a divergent view (say, by giving prominence to the numeral). Although he assumes only one pair, like extra-biblical cosmogonies, he yet shows by the collective 'man' of v.[26], that with him the emphasis does not at all fall upon this point. What he emphasises is that God created men in His image (and with difference of sex, cf. Mt 19^{4}), and that in their relation to God, by their possessing the divine image, they are all equal. In the recognition of this position religion itself is concerned.—DILLMANN.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

The Ideal Conception of Man and his Destiny.

By the Rev. George S. Goodspeed, M.A., Chicago.

This sublime picture is the condition of all prophecy and of all history as under special divine guidance, and as a ground of hope. What is it that is here promised?

I. Man's nature is godlike. The essential being of man is identical with that of his Creator.

II. The purpose of his creation is that he may become the lord of the world. The proper translation of the second clause in v.[26] is not 'let them,' but 'that they may have dominion over,' etc.

III. This lofty purpose is to be accomplished by the human race; it is 'the gradual taking possession of a kingdom given to mankind by God.'

Let us try to realize what this ideal conception involves; what hope lies within it. The man to whom it was revealed, and who uttered it, was conscious in himself that mankind had not yet attained unto it, that the attainment was far distant. In his utterance there lies the inspired thought of a glorious future, that man is designed for something infinitely beyond what he has yet attained; that he was born to be a king; that he was intended by nature for companionship with God, and that these fundamental purposes, because divine, shall ultimately be realised. This sublime prophecy, therefore, is the basis and foundation of all that is to follow. The purpose and the progress of salvation is made possible because of this primal fact.

II.

Man created in God's Image.

By the late Dean Vaughan.

We may select just three characteristics in which among lower creatures man has no fellow and no rival.

1. *Spirituality.*—'God is Spirit.' And man is spirit in a sense in which no lower creature is.

We are *in* flesh like the rest of the animals, but if we are *of* flesh we are brutes and not men. It is spirit that makes man capable of communion with God. Has spirit not yet wakened into consciousness in us? Have we not yet held converse with Him in the fellowship of Spirit, as made in His likeness?

2. *Sympathy.*—Sympathy is God's and man's. Fellow-suffering may be the brute's. But sympathy and fellow-suffering are not the same. Two oxen may tread the same weary threshing-floor, and be galled with the same sting, but there is no sympathy between them, not even pity. But the man who has not felt the wound may sympathise with him who has, by an instinct of intelligence, which is, being interpreted, an intensity of loving. God does not suffer, He sympathises fully; for God is love.

3. *Influence.*—Influence is by name and essence that gentle flowing in of one nature and one personality into another, which touches the spring of will, and makes the volition of the one the volition of the other. But without spirit there can be no action at all of one upon another; and without sympathy there can be no such action as this. Now, as the divine attribute of sympathy wrought in the incarnation, the passion, and the intercession of the Eternal Son, so the divine attribute of influence works in the Eternal Spirit, to be the ever-present teacher and comforter of those who yield themselves to His guidance.

Illustrations.

The Incarnation of the Son of God and the gift of the Holy Ghost are consequences (so to speak) of the first chapter of Genesis. The worth of the human being, as there asserted, makes him the proper subject of redemption, and the means which are used for it are justified by his original relation to God. Why was it fit that the Word should be made flesh? Because He was the light of man in the order of nature before He became so in the order of grace; and, when that light only lingered in a darkness which comprehended it not, it became needful that the true Light, which lighteth every man, should personally come into the world. Only because man had been made in the image of God was it possible that God should be 'made in the likeness of man.' The whole doctrine of Christ as 'Goel' (kinsman-redeemer) rests on the same basis. So also does the doctrine of the issue of that redemption, in the new man raised up in Christ, and, not only in the sense of capacity, but in the sense of actual character, 'created after the image of God in righteousness and truth of holiness'; made the habitation of His Holy Spirit, and the heir of His kingdom and glory.—T. D. Bernard.

The heathen, recognising in their own way the spiritual in man, tried to bridge over the chasm between it and the earthly by making God more human. The way of revelation, on the contrary, is to make man more godlike, to tell of the divine idea yet to be realised in his nature.—F. W. Robertson.

The divine likeness is still discernible even upon the lost and missing coin. Dust and mire may have gathered upon it; rude hands may have scraped away from it the sharpness and precision of the cutting, but it is God's coin still; and because it is so He still seeks, yea lights the candle of His Word, and sweeps the house of earth till He shall find it. Spirituality may become dreaminess, may become superstition, may become idolatry; sympathy may become feebleness; intelligence may become rebellious; influence may become debasement, may become entanglement, may become temptation. None the less are they all divine in their origin, relics of the image and superscription celestial, divine also in their capacity for blessing, and in their communication of blessing, when the Spirit of God touches them, breathes upon them from on high.—C. J. Vaughan.

There's not a man
That lives, who hath not known his godlike hours,
And feels not what an empire we inherit.

Wordsworth.

There is a story in English history of a child of one of our noble houses who, in the last century, was stolen from his home by a sweep. The parents spared no expense and trouble in their search for him, but in vain. A few years later the lad happened to be sent by the master into whose hands he had then passed to sweep the chimneys in the very house from which he had been stolen while too young to remember it. The little fellow had been sweeping the chimney of one of the bedrooms, and fatigued with the exhausting labour to which so many lads, by the cruel customs of those times, were bound, he quite forgot where he was, and flinging himself upon the clean bed dropped off to sleep. The lady of the house happened to enter the room. At first she looked in disgust and anger at the filthy black object which was soiling her counterpane. But all at once something in the expression of the little dirty face, or some familiar pose of the languid limbs, drew her nearer with a sudden inspiration, and in a moment she had clasped once more in her arms her long lost boy. Even so to-night, if you are repentant, God will not wait for you to put on the ring, and the shoes, and the best robe before running to embrace you. In your rags He can recognise you for His own prodigal son. The encrusted defilement of the world He can remove, and can bring out once more the brightness of His own image.—H. W. Horwill.

The 'image of God,' according to these ancient Scriptures, does not necessarily include moral and spiritual perfection; it must include the possibilities of achieving it; it reveals the divine purpose that man should achieve it; but man, even after he has sinned, still retains the 'image of God' in the sense in which it is attributed to him in the Hebrew Scriptures. It belongs to his *nature*, not to his *character*.

Man was made in the 'image of God' because he is a free, intelligent, self-conscious, and moral Personality. Some of these attributes may be found, in an inferior degree, in inferior races; but whatever premonitions of his greatness they may exhibit he stands alone and supreme; and in virtue of this solitary supremacy man, under God, is the Sovereign of Creation.—R. W. DALE.

MAN is God's image; but a poor man is
Christ's stamp to boot: both images regard.
GEORGE HERBERT.

MEN and women are introduced with equal rights; they share the government of the earth; they bear both the same image of God; they are ennobled with the same soul, although it may, in women, dwell in a weaker frame; both may claim the same prerogatives; and if there is a difference, it is in the beautiful comparison of Luther, that 'man is like the sun of heaven, woman like the moon; whilst the animals are the stars over which sun and moon rule.'—M. M. KALISCH.

DOMINION is a very solemn thing; it may oppress, crush, destroy. The Father must have a guarantee for its gentleness. What guarantee can there be but His own image—the possession of a nature tender as the divine? Ye who torture the beast of the field, have you considered the ground of your authority? Have you pondered why it is that God has given you the dominion? It is because He meant you to have His image ere you began to reign.—G. MATHESON.

Sermons for Reference.

Alexander (W.), Norwich Cathedral Discourses, 151.
Alford (H.), Quebec Chapel Sermons, iv. 35.
Baring-Gould (S.), Village Preaching for a Year, ii. 9.
Church (R. C.), Village Sermons, iii. 64.
Dale (R. W.), Christian Doctrine, 170.
Gibbon (J. M.), Image of God, 1.
Goodwin (H.), Parish Sermons, v. 1.
Goulburn (E. M.), Pursuit of Holiness, 102.
Gray (H.), Parting Memorial, 286.
Horwill (H. W.), Old Gospel in the New Era, 53.
Jones (W. B.), Old Testament Outlines, 4.
Kingsley (C.), Gospel of the Pentateuch, 22.
Martin (S.), Westminster Chapel Pulpit, 1878, 210.
Matheson (G.), Searchings in the Silence, 215.
Murray (A.), With Christ in the School of Prayer, 137.
Parker (J.), Sermons, i. 164.
Reeve (J. W.), Forty-two Sermons, Nos. 55, 128.
Robertson (F. W.), Notes on Genesis, 9.
Selby (T. G.), Lesson of a Dilemma, 264.
Tholuck (A.), Hours of Devotion, 370.
Woodford (J. R.), Sermons preached in Various Churches, 33.

An Archaeological Commentary on Genesis.

BY A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

XXXVII. 5. Dreams played an important part in the ancient world, as they still do in modern Egypt. Among the cuneiform tablets from the library of Nineveh are portions of a work on the interpretation of dreams, and similar treatises existed in Egypt. In the inscriptions of Gudea, the priest-king of Tello, in Southern Babylonia (*cir.* B.C. 2700), we read that all his works were commanded him by the gods, who revealed their will to him in dreams, and the explanation of his dreams was furnished him by the goddess Nina, also by means of a dream. When Teumman of Elam declared war against Assur-bani-pal, the Assyrian king entered the temple of Istar, and, 'bowing down,' besought her help, which she promised to give him, and that night 'a certain seer dreamed a dream,' in which Istar appeared with weapons in her hands, and declared that she would fight for the Assyrians and give them victory. In consequence of a dream in which the god Harmakhis appeared to Thothmes IV. when, tired by hunting, he once lay down and slept under the shadow of the Sphinx, the sand was cleared away from that monument, and a temple built between its paws. A thousand years later, the Ethiopian king Nut-Amon was summoned by a dream to march into Egypt. And in the Greek age, when the temple of Seti at Abydos was in ruins, an oracle was established in one of its chambers, the answers coming to those who consulted it in 'true dreams' at night.

17. Dothan, now Tell Dothân, has been identified with the Tuthina of the geographical list of Thothmes III.

28. We learn from papyri and other monuments that Syrian slaves were especially prized in Egypt. Kan'amu, or 'Canaanites,' was even a synonym for 'slaves.' The introduction of the 'Midianites, merchantmen,' is difficult to account for, except upon the supposition that two accounts lay before the author of the narrative, in one of which 'a caravan of Ishmaelites,' bringing spices from

Gilead, was spoken of; in the other, Midianites from the spice-bearing countries of the south. Perhaps we ought to read 'and the merchants passed by,' the introduction of the name of the Midianites being due to ver. 36. Here the mention of the Midianites would be natural enough, as the Midianites were the regular merchants to whom the Ishmaelites would have sold the slave. That the text of the narrative is corrupt in places is clear from ver. 32, where the sense requires 'took' instead of 'sent.'

36. Potiphar is an abbreviated form of the Egyptian Potipherah (xli. 46), *i.e.* Pa-du-pa-Ra, 'the gift of the sun-god.' Such names were common in Egypt after the age of the twenty-second dynasty (of Shishak), and more especially under the twenty-sixth dynasty (of Psammetichus). Egyptologists have therefore argued that the narrative of Joseph cannot be earlier than the tenth century B.C. But, Mr. Tomkins has pointed out, the progress of Oriental archæology has shown, time after time, that the 'supposed proof of a negative from the limitation of one's own knowledge, is not to be called a proof at all,' and that a stele of the time of Thothmes III., now in the Louvre, contains the name of a certain Pa-th(u)-Ba'al, who must have lived in the age of the Hyksos, and been of Semitic descent. The abbreviated form of the name seems to indicate that it was familiar to Semitic mouths. The form, however, is curious, as we should have expected Pi-di-phar. But we find Puti-el in Ex. vi. 25 (corresponding to Pa-thu-Baal); and Esar-haddon writes the name of the Egyptian prince Pa-du-Bast in exactly the same way, Pu-ṭu-Bisti. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the Egyptian article usually appears as *Pa*, but sometimes also *Pu*, and even *Bi*. Potiphar is called 'the eunuch of Pharaoh,' and Ebers notes that although monogamy was the rule in ancient Egypt, the Pharaoh had many wives, and that in a scene at Beni-Hassan (of the twelfth dynasty), two eunuchs are represented watching over some women at the loom. Rosellini also has noted the representation of eunuchs on the monuments (ii. 3. pp. 132 *sqq.*). Modern instances in Turkish lands show that eunuchs can be married and keep harems. But it is possible that the word *rab* has dropped out before *saris*; in this case we should have the Assyrian title Rab-sa-resi (Rab-saris in 2 Kings xviii. 17), 'prince of the chiefs.' See, however, xl. 2, where the use of the word is strange. It is uncertain whether we should translate 'captain of the guard' or 'chief of the cooks'; there was a 'superintendent of the cooks' (*sefdu*) in the court of the Pharaoh, and a priestly official was named the *sefdi*, or 'slaughterer.' In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the 'bodyguard' is called *tsabi bitate*, literally 'the soldiers of the palace,' as opposed to the *tsabi matsarti*, 'the soldiers of the guard' on foreign service, the *tsabi yidati* or 'auxiliaries,' the *tsabi saruti* or 'militia,' and the *khabbati* or Bedouin irregulars. An 'officer' is named *rabitsu*, 'the lier in wait,' of which in one of the letters *zukin* (perhaps Heb. *śokên*) is said to be the Canaanitish equivalent.

XXXVIII. 1. In the *Travels of a Mohar*, Adullam is coupled with Zidiputha, which, under the form of Zidiputh-el, is placed by Shishak in the south of Judah.

3, 4. It is a curious coincidence that in Sumerian *eri* and *unu* alike meant 'city.'

12. Sennacherib, in the account of his campaign against Hezekiah, speaks of having captured 'Eltekeh and Timnah' (*Tamnâ*).

14. Render 'in the opening of 'Enayim' ('the two springs'). It is called 'Ani, 'the two springs,' in the list of Thothmes III. Probably there was a chapel at the spot to the god of the spring.

18. The dress of the Babylonian gentleman was not complete without his seal-cylinder for sealing documents, his staff, and his bracelets; see *Herodotus*, i. 195.

21. The *qedêshâh* ('harlot') was the 'consecrated' prostitute of Asherah and Ashtoreth, who was called by the same name in Phœnician. Th Assyrian word was *qadistu*, and in an old table of Babylonian laws we read, 'Hereafter the *qadistu* may ply her calling in the street.'

XXXIX. 7, etc. There is a close resemblance between the narrative in Genesis and the beginning of an Egyptian romance, *The Tale of The Two Brothers*, which was compiled out of older materials by the scribe Enna for Seti II., the grandson of Rameses II., while he was still crown-prince. We are told that there were once two brothers, the elder of whom was named Anup, and the younger Baba. Anup had a house and wife, 'and his younger brother lived with him as a son.' One day Anup sent Baba from the field where they

were working to the house to fetch some seed-corn. Then the story proceeds, according to Brugsch's translation: 'And his younger brother found the wife of his elder brother occupied in combing her hair. And he said to her, Rise up, give me seed-corn, that I may return to the field, for thus has my elder brother enjoined me, to return without delaying. The woman said to him, Go in, open the chest, that thou mayest take what thy heart desires, for otherwise my locks will fall to the ground. And the youth went within into the stable, and took thereout a large vessel, for it was his will to carry out much seed-corn. And he loaded himself with wheat and dhurra, and went out with it. Then she said to him, How great is the burden in thy arms? He said to her, Two measures of dhurra and three measures of wheat make together five measures which rest on my arms. Thus he spake to her. But she spake to the youth and said, How great is thy strength! Well have I remarked thy power many a time. And her heart knew him. . . . And she stood up and laid hold of him, and said unto him, Come, let us celebrate an hour's repose; the most beautiful things shall be thy portion, for I will prepare for thee festal garments. Then was the youth like unto the panther of the south for rage, on account of the wicked word which she had spoken to him. But she was afraid beyond all measure. And he spake to her and said, Thou, O woman, hast been like a mother unto me, and thy husband like a father, for he is older than I, so that he might have been my begetter. Wherefore this great sin which thou hast spoken unto me? Say it not to me another time, then will I this time not tell it, and no word of it shall come out of my mouth to any man at all. And he loaded himself with his burden and went out into the field. And he went to his elder brother, and they completed their day's work. And when it was evening the elder brother returned home to his house. And his younger brother followed behind his oxen, heavily laden himself with all the good things of the field, and he drove his oxen before him to bring them to the stable. And behold the wife of his elder brother was afraid because of the word which she had spoken, and she took a jar of fat and was like unto one to whom an evil-doer had offered violence, since she wished to say to her husband, Thy younger brother has offered me violence. And her husband returned home at evening according to his daily custom, and found his wife lying stretched out and suffering from injury. She poured no water over his hands, as was her custom; she had not lighted the lights for him, so that his house was in darkness, and she lay there ill. And her husband said to her, Who has had to do with thee? Lift thyself up! She said to him, No one has had to do with me except thy younger brother, since when he came to take seed-corn for thee he found me sitting alone, and said to me, Come, let us make merry an hour, and repose: let down thy hair! Thus he spake to me; but I did not listen to him (but said), See, am I not thy mother, and is not thy elder brother like a father to thee? Thus I spake to him, but he did not hearken to my speech, but used violence with me, that I might not tell thee. Now if thou allow him to live, I will kill myself. Then the elder brother began to rage like a panther; he sharpened his knife and took it in his hand.' The sun-god, however, came to the help of Baba. First the cows warned him that Anup was intending to kill him, then, as he fled from his pursuer, a river full of crocodiles was interposed between him and his brother. In the morning he convinced Anup of his innocence, who returned home and put his wife to death.

14. Chabas believed that he had found the name of the Hebrews in the hieratic papyri at Leyden, under the form of 'Apuriu. The 'Apuriu are described as foreigners who were employed in digging stone for the buildings of Ramses II. and his successors. But the identification has been doubted, since, according to an inscription at Hammamât, Ramses IV. of the twentieth dynasty employed 800 'Apuriu to transport his blocks from the quarries there, and in another inscription they are stated to have belonged to the 'bow (or auxiliary force) of the Anuti barbarians'—that is to say, the barbarian tribes east of the Thebaid. Some of these tribes, however, may have been Semitic Bedouin, as they are to-day, and the name of 'Apuriu may have lost its ethnic meaning and come to signify simply 'drawers of stone,' just as the name of the Nubian Mazai came to signify first, 'the police,' and then 'soldiers' generally. Brugsch makes the 'Apuriu 'sailors.'

20. The Egyptian law did not allow a master to punish his slave with death for the crime of which Joseph was accused; see Diod. i. 77.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

THE CHRISTIAN PICTORIAL. (*Alexander & Shepheard.* 4to, pp. 308. 4s. 6d.)

It is the triumph of successful editing when every number of a periodical quivers with immediate interest, and yet the numbers may be bound and preserved for future use in a handsome volume. That triumph the editor of *The Christian Pictorial* reached at once, and holds it still. Its permanent interest lies chiefly in the record it contains of the public religious work of every year, and the portraits it presents of the public religious men.

Messrs. Alexander & Shepheard have also published *Things that are Made*, being devotional meditations in the haunts of Nature, by Alfred J. Barnford.

IN HIS STEPS. By Charles M. Sheldon. (*Allenson.* Crown 8vo, pp. 282.)

'In His Steps; or, What would Jesus Do?' has been written by an American preacher, and has been read by a vast American audience. It comes to us with the unmistakable American flavour, but beneath that there is the solid substance of the universal gospel-call to sacrifice. 'What would Jesus Do?' said Henry Maxwell, and resolved to answer it in every act of his ministerial and private life. 'What would Jesus Do?' he persuaded many of his congregation to ask, and the town was changed incredibly. 'What would Jesus Do?'—will such a question *work*? we ask. This book answers that it will.

Mr. Allenson has also published *Immortality on God's Terms*, by G. P. M'Kay (fcap. 8vo, pp. 96, 1s.), an effort to establish the doctrine of Conditional Immortality by an examination of the language of Scripture. It seeks especially to meet the objection that this is a degrading doctrine.

READINGS FROM THE PENTATEUCH: EXODUS. By T. W. Peile, M.R.A.C. (*Bemrose.* 8vo, pp. 320–707. 5s. net.)

These readings are prepared on the basis that the writings of Moses afford internal evidence of their genuine and authentic character which no external evidence is able to nullify, and that there is no real antagonism between natural science and theology, which is the science of spiritual and moral facts and phenomena. And so the author quotes the men who agree with that basis, and passes the others by. It is a frankly confessed bias for the old ways, and it will be welcomed heartily by those who love them still.

THE PEOPLE AND THE PRIEST. By the Rev. R. E. Welsh, M.A. (*Bowden.* Fcap. 8vo, pp. 199.)

In this volume—which the publisher has produced in a novel and charming style—Mr. Welsh covers the ground, the whole practical ground, of our controversy with Rome. Why not accept the pope, you said? There are many good reasons. And in all the literature that the present stress is likely to call forth, nothing will be found clearer or gentler than this.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY: ST. LUKE. By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* Post 8vo, Second Edition, pp. lxxxviii, 592. 12s.)

The reception given to Dr. Plummer's *St. Luke* proves that the very best biblical scholarship may be sure not only of a welcome, but even of a wide welcome in England. German scholars envy us this—not the welcome, but the extent of it. They dare not publish, they say; they dare not publish except in the flimsiest binding and the poorest paper. This volume is as handsome as the art of the printer and binder can make it, no expense at all is spared there. The new edition contains a new preface and sundry corrections and small additions. Some little things we had marked on our copy of the first edition have been put right, the great things seemed to be right already.

THE HOLY BIBLE: REVISED VERSION, WITH MARGINAL REFERENCES. (Oxford: *At the University Press.* 8vo. 5s.)

Simple as they appear, there is nothing connected with a Bible that costs more labour than the marginal references. They have a curious and even painful history. Men of the highest attainments have given many precious years of their life to make the marginal references suffi-

cient and reliable, and the reward they have reaped is namelessness and death. The Revised Version does at least name the men who have furnished its references, and in that it has done well, but it has not come between them and death. Scrivener and Moulton are their names. Their work has been supplemented and finished by others, and now we have in the margin of the Revised Version the best array of parallel passages in the world.

For that alone this latest edition of the Revised Version is in front of all that went before it. But it has other merits. Its chapter and verse numbers are clear and intelligible for the first time. And it has a little change for which we have pleaded long, chapter and verse are marked at the outer as well as the inner top margin, the page, which is of no consequence, being transferred to the bottom.

THE CHURCH HYMNARY. The Music edited by Sir John Stainer. (*Frowde*. Crown 8vo, pp. 864. 2s. 6d. net.)

We welcomed the *Hymnary* when the edition with words alone came out, and we should like to welcome it yet more heartily with the music. But this edition is a little disappointing. The binding is very plain, and the paper is very poor. No doubt that is partly due to the necessity of keeping the price very low. But the paper in the cheapest 'word' edition is much better, and it costs only 3d. in limp cloth. Many of us are ready to introduce the *Church Hymnary* at once, and we would encourage our people to get an edition with music; but this copy that has reached us would last no time. Perhaps it is a bad specimen, for we see that the waste paper at the end is torn away, and the binding begun to go. Still we feel that for so thick a book, and for a book that is to be in constant use, a stronger binding than this is absolutely necessary, though a little more should have to be paid for it. The printing is as good as it could be. We have not seen the sol-fa edition.

THE CHURCH OF THE WEST IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By Herbert B. Workman, M.A. (*Kelly*. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 316. 2s. 6d.)

This is the first volume of a promising work on the history of European Christianity in the Middle Ages. It carries the history from Gregory the Great to St. Bernard. It is a popular conception, being one of Mr. Gregory's 'Books for Bible Students,' but it is written with knowledge and, what is not less commendable, with genuine Christian sympathy.

GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. By Friedrich Blass, D.Ph., D.Th., LL.D. Translated by H. St. John Thackeray, M.A. (*Macmillan*. 8vo, pp. 340. 14s.)

We shall have New Testament Grammars enough by and by. Besides those known, there are the Schmiedel-Winer lately appeared, the Moulton-Winer coming, and the fine translation of Blass before us.

Blass's Grammar is distinctive. It is the work of a classical scholar. That means that outside illustration is more and exegesis less than in Winer or even Buttmann. And that means very much. It means that we must have both a Winer and a Blass. We certainly cannot do without the age-long results of believing exegesis,—in this Blass is too bold and independent,—and as little can we do without the flash of interpretation, the sudden conviction, that comes from a well-chosen classical parallel.

Another striking feature of Blass is this. The manuscripts are cited, not the editions. To the scholar, even to half a scholar, that is a great gain. It is a distinct advance on New Testament grammatical work. For B I know and A I know, but who are Tregelles and Hort? We have the materials, we can make up our own minds. It is an anti-popish proceeding, no doubt. It would be easier far to surrender our minds to the great editors, and ask them to make them up for us. But it pays in the end.

We have searched through the book,—being always delighted with the extraordinary accuracy of its printing,—and have placed our queries and exclamations down its margin after the most approved fashion. But we have always found one thing—unfettered freshness of thought. Dr. Blass owns obligation to Winer, Buttmann, and Burton; but that is in his amiable preface,—we find little trace of obligation in the book. Of course, Dr. Blass refers to these grammars for fuller discussion, or for corroboration of his points. But his points are his own, and they are incisive.

Blass has sprung into New Testament scholarship fully armed. His success has been dazzlingly

rapid. This valuable and stimulating book will give him a place beside the very foremost of our English New Testament scholars—beside the few of whom we are so proud.

Those who know Mr. Thackeray's work in the new *Dictionary of the Bible* will not be surprised at the accuracy and finish of the translation.

THE MODERN READER'S BIBLE: ST. LUKE AND ST. PAUL (Two Vols.), AND ST. JOHN. (*Macmillan.* 12mo. 2s. 6d. each.)

Whatever Professor Moulton touches becomes alive. No man ever conceived a more unpropitious project than this. Yet it is successful. For it is impressed with a living energetic hand.

Nothing would surprise us less than to find that 'The Modern Reader's Bible' was become the favourite for school and college use, and even for private reading, if the reader reads for more than self-satisfaction.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER, I. I.–II. 17. BY THE LATE F. J. A. HORT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (*Macmillan.* 8vo, pp. xvi, 188. 6s.)

The New Testament student, the student who seeks to understand the New Testament unreservedly, cannot have too much of the late Professor Hort's writings. He now knows that Professor Hort was the least biassed, the most loyal to the simple truth as it is in Jesus, of all the men whom he has ever studied. And the student who has come to that conclusion must be glad to find it supported by the present Bishop of Durham. Dr. Westcott has written an Introduction to the volume before us. In a few carefully chosen sentences he describes Dr. Hort's mind and purpose as an expositor. He speaks of 'his remarkable power of setting aside all traditional opinion in examining the text before him'; he recalls 'his breadth and minuteness of view, free from every prepossession.' The student of Dr. Hort's writings is glad to have that said, and said by Dr. Westcott. For he has found it so. Strong as the words are—they are the deliberate result of more than forty years uninterrupted association—they are verified by the student himself.

And therefore even a fragment of Dr. Hort's work is valuable. We might say that no harm would have been done if Dr. Chase, who has so loyally edited this fragment, had completed the commentary. No harm but much good would have been done, for Dr. Chase's work is so sensitive to the claims of true Christian scholarship as to be in place beside Dr. Hort's. Still, this fragment is of great price. Every judgment it contains is weighty, every note is fertile.

The Notes, says the Bishop of Durham, require patient and reflective study. We would select for illustration the note on πιστὸς at 1^{21}, for, of course, Dr. Hort accepts that reading there. Its historical fulness is balanced by its exegetical insight. There is nothing to be added to it, except an additional example here and there from the Christian inscriptions, which Deissmann or Ramsay may give us.

One interest which attaches to this commentary is the light it reflects on Westcott and Hort's New Testament. Here we see how certain readings are made use of, what exegetical and theological value they possess, sometimes also what new reasons there are for their adoption.

CAMBRIDGE AND OTHER SERMONS. BY F. J. A. HORT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. x, 278. 6s.)

Dr. Hort's *Village Sermons* reminded us of Dean Church's. There was the same extreme desire to be understood, seen in the choice of the simplest words and the plainest order of thought. There was also the same atmosphere of the illimitable. Understand that, both seemed to say, but understand that that is only a pebble off the shore of infinite Christian truth. The village hearers would go home from both preachers saying, 'We got something to-day,' and feeling that there was immensely more to get yet.

The new volume of Dr. Hort's sermons contains more village sermons, and they have these characteristics also. It also contains university sermons, which are its surprise. For they too are simple and illimitable. The language is not perhaps so very primitive, but it is chosen with equal care; the thought is built on equally regular lines, and the same air of expansiveness is all around.

Messrs. Macmillan have also published *The Epistle to the Colossians*, with Analysis and Examination Notes, by the Rev. G. W. Garrod, M.A. (crown 8vo, pp. 176, 3s.), and if the Epistle to the Colossians is to be read in schools or colleges, this is the edition to use.

STUDIES OF THE MIND AND ART OF ROBERT BROWNING. By James Fotheringham. (*Horace Marshall.* Crown 8vo, pp. xx, 576. 7s. 6d.)

Among the books on Browning, which are many, Mr. Fotheringham's has a place. It has passed to a third edition, revised and enlarged. It owes its place chiefly to the arrangement of its matter. With magnificent courage Mr. Fotheringham headed one chapter 'Browning's Criticism of Life,' and many persons who would not read a criticism of *Sordello*, read that chapter greedily. He headed another 'The Ideal of Religion,' and again the many who were interested in that read greedily. A third he headed 'Psychological Studies,' and once more the philosophical readers read greedily. It is the easier way after all. The courage was only in attempting it. One who could say nothing profitable even on *Saul* by way of formal criticism, could gather many striking thoughts on the 'Nature Poetry in Browning.' And even if he gathered little, the reader is so much more easily pleased with that. For he feels he is learning something about a great practical part of study, and perhaps storing up material for future use. And Mr. Fotheringham meets the case of the easily bewildered reader of Browning. He is never bewildering.

This third edition is altogether another book, fuller, deeper, stronger. There is Browning enough left for a second volume like it. We hope Mr. Fotheringham will write that volume.

SERMONS TO YOUNG BOYS. By the Rev. F. de W. Lushington, M.A. (*Murray.* Crown 8vo, pp. 107. 3s. 6d.)

Mr. Lushington preached these sermons to boys under fourteen, boys just ready to be sent to the great public schools. He does not count these boys beneath the attention of a serious sermon. He holds the truth that their character is mostly made by the time they enter the public schools, and he strives to make their character Christ-like. There is anecdote, but it is incidental not ornamental: it serves the preacher's serious purpose.

LESSONS FROM THE CROSS. By the Bishop of London. (*Nisbet.* Crown 8vo, pp. 132. 2s. 6d.)

A volume of sermons on the Cross of Christ, delivered in St. Paul's during Holy Week. A volume of exceptional courage and insight. The Cross on that side, the whole world on this—that is its declaration. All the influences that count as most respectable—political, social, and intellectual; all the parties into which contemporary life was divided; public opinion in every phase in which it expressed itself—all against Jesus, and Jesus against all. And it is so still. Sin clings to them all, to us all, to all our actions, motives, everything, and it is a crucifying of Jesus every moment. A volume of sermons on sin that might be the work of Owen or of Alexander Whyte.

WHEREIN? By the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan. (*Nisbet.* Crown 8vo, pp. 114. 1s. 6d.)

Wherein? is a volume of expository addresses on Malachi. There is scholarship, and the evangelical religion. There is even close pressure of of present-day duty. But what a title is *Wherein?* It is amazing that men will deliberately throw their books away, by the use of a title that has nothing in it.

THE GOD OF OUR PLEASURES. By Mark Guy Pearse. (*Nisbet.* Crown 8vo, pp. ix, 92. 1s. 6d.)

Mr. Pearse is one of the great preachers, he dare not be imitated. Perhaps he is more minutely characteristic than any of our great preachers. We think we could tell by a paragraph, often by a sentence, what is his. The six sermons in his new book are characteristic. But they are fresh, even from him. For they take us to the things of nature, and they keep us there till we drink in nature and with it nature's God, and find Him the God of our innocent outside pleasures.

FROM FACT TO FAITH. By the Rev. J. Monro Gibson, M.A., D.D. (*Nisbet.* Fcap. 8vo, pp. 151. 2s. 6d.)

When Christianity was ecclesiasticism it was no wonder that men rejected it. Now it is not so. You may follow the Lord Jesus Christ now, though you do not follow the pope. And that being so, what ails men at Christianity? Perhaps two ailments may be named, ignorance and wilfulness. For wilfulness, which rejects Christ because He insists on their rejecting sin, there is no remedy. For ignorance there is. And Dr. Monro Gibson is one of the most successful men we know in applying it. In this little book he appeals to the practical man who is ignorant, the man who knows a little about science and a good deal about machinery. So he starts with the machinery. Here are certain things the practical man knows about—the struggle for existence and the like.

But these things lead to other things. The facts lead to faith. And it is all reasonable, readable.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By the Rev. A. Welch. (*Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier.* Crown 8vo, pp. 214. 3s. 6d.)

Once more we have the whole question of the authorship of the Hebrews raised, capably, cleverly raised, and once more a new author is advocated. It is the apostle Peter. Now, Mr. Welch has not proved that St. Peter wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. It would take more than the thirty pages of this essay to do that. But he has done something substantial both for St. Peter and for the Epistle. He has brought them together, and the repeated contact has cast most useful sparks of light on both. Henceforth writers on either subject will find suggestion here. The rest of the volume is expository. Besides three on Melchizedek, there are papers on the Spirits in Prison, the Significance of Baptism, the Death to Sin, and other kindred subjects. And all are alive with exegetical emotion. Mr. Welch has as keen an expository interest as one could desire, and he turns it to profitable account. He never mistakes dogmatism for suggestion. If he could settle these knotty problems, he might not do us so much good as he does by rousing us into interest over them.

KOREAN SKETCHES. By the Rev. J. S. Gale, B.A. (*Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier.* Crown 8vo, pp. 256. 3s. 6d.)

The book is well named. These are sketches. The touch is light to the border of flippancy. For example: 'In medicine his [the native doctor's, his name was Mr. Moon] great success had rested on the classification of diseases under two heads, desperate cases and general weakness. For the latter he prescribed pills made from tiger bones. He reasoned logically that as the tiger is the strongest animal, and the bones the strongest part of him, consequently such pills must be strengthening in any case. For the former he had a solemn mixture that he spoke of with bated breath. It was made of snakes and toads and centipedes carefully boiled together, and warranted to kill or cure.'

Even the missionary chapter, for there is a missionary chapter, is very light reading. Mr. Gale has passed through many tribulations in Korea, but they have left him light-hearted. The photographic illustrations are numerous, and will be much appreciated.

FAMOUS SCOTS: R. L. STEVENSON. By Margaret Moyes Black. (*Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier.* Crown 8vo, pp. 159. 1s. 6d.)

To the unblessed Bohemian who says, Now, what *is* all this fuss over Stevenson about? this book will come with the needed blessing. It does not wholly account for the fuss—the devotion, we mean—it is true. National worship is a subtle thing, not to be expressed in grammatical sentences. But it gives some good reasons for the good opinion his countrymen have of Robert Louis Stevenson. A novelist, and a wild one, but a heroic soul. A dweller in uncivilized Samoa, but a writer of purest English undefiled. A brother of men, but born for the adversity of perpetual exile from his brothers. A combination, we must almost admit it,—Miss Margaret Moyes Black does not cease to insist upon it,—a combination of uncertain, unresolvable materials which we call genius. His ambitions never interfered with his true and deep modesty, and here they are crowned and smiling—he is numbered among the Famous Scots.

Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier have also published *The Fine Art of Smiling*, and other papers, by Margaret Maclure, a happy hit for girls' clubs and the like, as well as for private reading, with a Preface from the Countess of Aberdeen; *Agatha's Unknown Way*, by 'Pansy,' a short argument for missionary interest, in the form of a fresh well-told story; and *Green Garry*, a healthy school story, by Marianne Kirlew. (Crown 8vo, pp. 220. 2s. 6d.)

HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL. By C. H. Cornill, Ph.D., S.T.D. (Chicago: *Open Court Pub. Co.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.)

Many attempts have been made since Old Testament criticism settled down into a science, to write the history of Israel popularly. And some of these attempts are highly meritorious, especially Kittel's and Kent's. But Cornill has been most successful. His book is smallest and it is easiest to read. He has the master faculty of seizing the essential and passing by the accidental. His style (especially as freely translated into English

by Professor Carruth of Kansas) is pleasing and restful. Nor is he excessively radical. If Isaac and Ishmael are races, Abraham is an individual still. And, above all, he has a distinct heroic faith in the Divine mission of Israel.

OUR INDIAN SISTERS. By the Rev. E. Storrow. (*R.T.S.* Crown 8vo, pp. 256, with illustrations, 3s. 6d.)

When the next Indian Mutiny begins, we shall lament with bitter lamentation that we did not do more for the women of India when we had the chance. For the future of India is in their hands, with all their feebleness and degradation. We have done no more for them because we have not yet realized their power—their power to keep India in enmity to us. We do not know them. Mr. Storrow does, however, and he has written the Introduction to the subject. Begin with it. You will go on till you know.

METHODS OF SOUL-CULTURE. By the Rev. J. A. Clapperton, M.A. (*R.T.S.* Fcap. 8vo, pp. 96. 1s. 6d.)

If the title is commonplace, the contents are not so. There are certain virtues, graces, call them what you will. The first is Courage. How is it to be mine? Mr. Clapperton has three methods of working that out. First, he sets us test questions, as 'Am I shy by nature? How much of this shyness is lack of courage? Have I publicly sided with Christ? Have I joined some section of His Church? If not, is it not largely or altogether because of a lack of courage?' Next he has 'Lower Helps' to Courage. They are 'Conquer ridicule,' 'Brace the heart,' 'Rejoice in difficulty,' and others, and each is flashed home with an anecdote. Lastly, there are 'Higher Helps' — 'Remember God's wisdom,' 'Remember Christ's love,' 'Keep a promise on the tongue,' and the like. The method is new, it will prevail.

THE BOY'S OWN ANNUAL and THE GIRL'S OWN ANNUAL. (*R.T.S.* 4to, pp. 824, 832. 8s. each.)

These handsome volumes must be noticed at once, that they may be in time for Christmas. They are strongly bound; they overflow with apt illustrations, some of which are coloured and yet truly artistic, and their reading matter is at once entertaining and wholesome. All *that* must be said of these fine old favourites; it could not be said of many other magazines for young people.

The R.T.S. has also published: (1) *A Letter for You* (2s.), being readings for mothers' meetings, evangelical to the core, with a preface by Dr. Moule; (2) *Insect Lives*, as told by themselves (1s. 6d.), by Edward Simpson, good for young dabblers in science, and accurately illustrated; (3) *Musings for Quiet Hours* (1s. 6d.), by G. S. Barrett, D.D., choice prayer-meeting addresses of ten minutes each; (4) *Midland Sketches* (1s. 6d.), by W. J. Gordon, one of the characteristic books of the R.T.S., the things of out daily life being made to minister to our knowledge and our sympathy. Here the things are found in the great manufacturing towns in the Midlands. The various industries are described and illustrated with utmost fidelity.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON LIFE AND CONDUCT. By Sophie Bryant, D.Sc. (*Sonnenschein.* Crown 8vo, pp. 100.)

Dr. Bryant's teaching ability and success are a proverb. Here, however, we are struck by the use of this work in family worship. Suppose we had this little book. The father reads the sentence or two of summary, then he or another reads the passages quoted, they are just enough for a reading. We predict the redoubled interest the worship would gain.

A New Manual of Theology.

Dr. William Clarke is a name unknown to us. But it is often said that the best work is done by unknown men, and there is no truer commonplace. Dr. Clarke is described in his title-page as Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University, Hamilton, New York. In New York he is probably now well known. For it is equally true that when men do good work they are not left in obscurity, the work itself declares them.

Dr. Clarke does his work and says little about it. There is not one word of preface to this volume. Its first paragraph is: 'Theology is preceded by religion, as botany by the life of

[1] *An Outline of Christian Theology.* By William Newton Clarke, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 8vo, pp. 488. 7s. 6d.

plants. Religion is the reality of which theology is the study.' We are in the heart of the subject at once.

The next impression is made by Dr. Clarke's interest in real life. In a sense he is aware of that. He is aware, for example, that theology may be made an abstract study. Then he says a scientific terminology might be advisable. But the practical point of view is more important; both for its own sake and for the sake of the Christian people, theology, he says, should be kept as near to actual life as possible. And so, as far as possible, he uses deliberately and delightfully the simplest language.

The next impression is the effect of his arrangement. It is chosen for simplicity, it ministers to effect. (1) Man, (2) God, (3) Sin, (4) Christ, (5) The Holy Spirit and the Divine Life in Man, (6) Things to Come. Each of these great divisions is clearly subdivided, and occupies a proportionate space. Each subdivision is so natural, related to its surroundings, and so transparent in thought and expression, that there is no missing the author's meaning.

The next impression made is by the firmness of the author's faith. It is not only, I know whom I have believed; it is also, I know what I have believed. And as he gives it to us, it carries the freshness of the present, the hope of the future. He believes it still, he will believe it more and more as he sees.

And the last impression is the absence of dogmatism. The faith is gentle, easy to be entreated. To hold firmly is not to pull tightly. He draws us with the cords of a Christian man, with the bands of Jesus' love.

Altogether the book, by being always clear and candid, is a surprise in theological literature. And it will charm any reader, as the simply expressed does charm always. If there is to be a resurrection of the doctrinal sermon, which we pray God hasten, this book will be sought on every hand. It is possible to make doctrine interesting as nothing else is interesting.

Sermonettes on the Golden Texts.

By the Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A., Aberdeen.

I.

'Yield yourselves unto the Lord, and enter into His sanctuary.'—2 Chron. xxx. 8.

The words translated 'yield yourselves' mean literally, as you will see in the margin, 'give the hand,' and the phrase is used in Scripture sometimes in the sense of submission, and sometimes of fidelity; generally, perhaps, both ideas are included. Let us take it in the two senses here, for both are needful in approaching God.

First, to give the hand in token of submission. Yield is not a very attractive word in some ways. We admire the man who does not yield to adverse fortune. It is not an agreeable word from a soldier's point of view. Let us do or die, but not yield, he would say. But the soldier, too, gives the best example, in the right sense, of yielding. He won't yield to the enemy, but there is perfect submission to the will of his commander. And it has been remarked of soldiers that, when they are Christians, they are usually thoroughgoing ones, with no half-measures or half-changes about them, but strong in the faith, and with a simple obedient life, proving themselves good soldiers too of Jesus Christ. 'What are the marching orders?' is the view they take.

When the present Emperor of Germany came to the throne, his will and Bismarck's came somewhat into collision, with the result that Bismarck had to give way and retire. 'Who can fight against the king?' said he. Yet it is evident that he yielded with an ill grace, and cherished a grudge. It is not an unwilling yielding, however, that is implied here; it is only a glad submission that will be acceptable to God,—the whole nature, every thought, brought into subjection. How gently, how hesitatingly, as it were, Christ comes to us! He will not thrust Himself upon anyone unwillingly. 'Behold a Stranger at the door, He gently knocks, has knocked before.' But if, outside the door, Christ is a patient Suppliant, inside

He will be nothing less than King. 'Yet know, nor of the terms complain, if Jesus comes, He comes to reign.'

Secondly, to give the hand means, sometimes, a pledge of fidelity. When Solomon came to the throne, all the princes and mighty men gave the hand to him in token of fidelity. At a coronation ceremony in our own land the oath the nobles take to king or queen is as follows:—'I do become thy liegeman of life and limb, and of earthly worship, and faith and love I will bear unto thee, to live and die against all manner of folks. So help me God.' Now, fidelity is a strong point, too, in our relationship to God. It is the faithful servant that gets the 'Well done' at heaven's gate. 'Oh, true and tried, so well and long!' the poet sings of an earthly attachment. Could anything finer be said of anyone as a servant of God? We have to be faithful to God in the darkness, and faithful to the light. Many things are dark to us. 'God moves in a mysterious way.' But we must trust Him where we cannot see. All is not dark, however. The heavenly vision comes in some measure to us all. Be not disobedient to it. 'Follow the gleam.'

Above all, should this spirit of submission and fidelity characterize us in entering the sanctuary. Any spirit of haughtiness, rebellion, or vainglory is most of all out of place there. And is not the sanctuary just the place where, in a special sense, God gives *His* hand too? If we give ours in token of submission and fidelity, God gives His there as a pledge that He will be true to all His great and gracious promises. 'Thy way is in the sea,' the Psalmist says, meaning that there God is afar off, obscure, incomprehensible; there His footsteps are not known. But he says also, 'Thy way is in the sanctuary.' There God is brought nigh. Love and mercy are associated with it. In the sea even His footsteps are not known, but in the sanctuary His hand is given with all His heart in it.

II.

'God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.'—Ps. xlvi. 1.

This is a verse, some might say, that is far beyond children. It implies a great experience, a passing through the troubled waters, a deliverance from some great danger. As well expect the birds of the air to take up such a theme as children. Well, we could not well imagine the birds chanting this Psalm. Their life is too little, their experience too limited, for them to strike such a lofty note. We might think of them praising God for their food, for the summer day, for the leafy boughs where they make their nests; but to take up such words as these of the text, in any real and worthy sense, would require some grand experience, far beyond them, to be passed through. So with children, it might be said, let them keep by the shepherd Psalm, and such like, as more suitable to their years. A great triumphant note like this would for them have 'little meaning though the words be strong.'

That is very questionable, however. For one thing, children, even if they have not come through great experiences such as might call forth this song, can imagine them, better often than older people. Boys, as a rule, like nothing better than to read of brave deeds, such as some of the 'deeds that won the Empire.' And their thoughts sometimes take a very vivid form, as when Coleridge, as a boy, was accused of stealing, when he was simply in imagination swimming the Hellespont as he went along the street, and his hands, in their motions, had come suspiciously near the pockets of someone passing by. Or, as when a lady, since become famous, wrote on the flyleaf of her geography in her school days, 'I am now alone on the bozom of the mity Mediteraneon.' So we could well understand even a child being absorbed in the story of the destruction of Sennacherib's host, or whatever called forth originally the triumphant shout of this Psalm, and singing the Psalm appreciatively in that light.

But far, far more than in that secondary sense the words may be taken up even by children. They do not apply merely to 'far-off things and battles long ago.' They describe what God has truly been to many a humble soul whose life outwardly may have been of the most uneventful kind. And not for men and women only, but for children also, the words may have a very genuine personal sense. To rule one's own spirit is better than to take a city, and needs more the Divine help. We all need, from earliest years, to flee to God for refuge. Our hearts soon begin to tell us that we are not right with God by nature. They would lead us, like Adam in the garden, to flee from God, but, as has been said, the only way to flee *from* God is to flee *to* God. And not as a

refuge only, but as our strength. Even a child may know something of this strength, for it is a strength that is strangely connected with weakness. A very present help in trouble, the Psalm says further, and though the Divine help may in one sense be needed more when the severer troubles come, yet, if our Heavenly Father condescends to be the Helper of men and women, it is not a great step further for *Him* to come down to the needs of even the very little ones.

And, moreover, is it not the best preparation for after years, to begin early to speak and sing in great terms of God? A king once got a poet to compose a poem on his victory, before, however, he had begun the battle. He was just a little too previous, as we say, for, after all, he was defeated. But you can never be too early in taking up such a note as this of the Psalm. Sing it even if it be partly on trust, and it will be found truer and truer as life goes on. Isn't it grand that we *can* sing of God in such a strain? It is only the Bible that can teach us to do so. It has got something to sing about.

III.

'If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.'—1 JOHN i. 9.

THAT seems very cheap and easy terms on which to get forgiveness. It is not so if you break the laws of nature. You don't escape the penalty by confession. Neither is it so if you break the laws of the land. But between the heart and God, Whose laws we have broken, His declaration is that forgiveness follows confession. It seems a great result depending upon so little, but is there anything grander or better that forgiveness *could* depend upon than confession? Would it not augur well for a boy's future if, having done something forbidden, he felt so miserable over it that he could not rest till he had told his father and asked his forgiveness? Would you not say that, by acting in that way, he was giving the promise of a good manhood? A parent might well have good hopes as to what the future of such a child would be. And could there be anything better or more helpful than to grant forgiveness to a confession of that kind? Suppose the father said, 'My boy, I am glad to hear your confession, but it would be too much to expect that I should forgive you right off. Let us say no more about it for six months, and I'll see how you behave meanwhile.' Observe, there might be cases in which such treatment might be needed. If a boy were found out doing wrong,—found out when all the time he had been trying or wishing to conceal his fault, then he might be best dealt with in such a way. But this is a case where, instead of being found out against his will, he makes confession of his own accord, simply because he feels so miserable under the consciousness of concealed guilt. Do you not think that immediate and full forgiveness would be the most helpful and saving thing for him in the circumstances? Well, it is so with the Divine forgiveness. The way of access to the Father has been opened up through Jesus Christ, and forgiveness is granted whenever there is true confession. Not for any great thing we must do as an equivalent, not after a long delay, a time of probation, but whenever in the right spirit we can say, 'I will arise, and go to my Father.'

And not only forgiveness, but the cleansing from all unrighteousness. Yes, that will follow from a sincere and penitent confession. Along with the blessedness of forgiveness comes an inner power that leads to the cleansing of the life. The prodigal son could not possibly have lived in the father's house, after the welcome home he received, without trying to get rid of all the evil effects of his sojourn in the far country. It would take him time, no doubt, but his whole heart would wish it, and he would have every help in the home surroundings.

Do not imagine, then, that free forgiveness leads to a low life. Quite the reverse. If you think you can live as you please, seeing that forgiveness is granted on such easy terms, that you can continue in sin that grace may abound, you have not got a glimmer yet of the blessed truth implied in the Divine pardon. You may have heard of the farmer who, having some remarkable fruit in his orchard, of abnormal size and excellence, thought it would be a nice gift to send to his king. It was heartily accepted, and, to his surprise, some days afterwards a present was sent to him in return of great value. A neighbouring farmer, hearing of this piece of good fortune, thought that he would try a similar method. So, gathering together a splendid assortment of fruit and flowers, he sent them to the king, and awaited with eagerness the grand present he was to get. Next morning, however, his own gift was sent back to him,—declined with thanks.

You see, the spirit of the two men was entirely different. There was honest kindliness in the one case; in the other, heartless deception, and each was treated just as he deserved. Well, let us not suppose that God can be deceived. If there be anything false in our confession, we shall deceive neither Him nor ourselves. His Spirit will not abide with us. We shall not have the sweet assent of a good conscience toward God. But, however ignorant, however fearful we may be, if there be sincerity in our confession, it will be accepted in His sight; He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

IV.

'My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not.'—PROV. i. 10.

You are not likely to go far in the world without meeting some who will entice you to an evil way. It may be sometimes those far older than yourself; and cursed above all beings is the old sinner who tries to lead youth astray. But, as a rule, the most powerful enticements come from vicious companions of about our own age. A difference in years brings with it natural barriers, which prevent the old and the young seeing things quite in the same way. They are separated naturally, to some extent, in their views and interests and aims. Had Eli's sons, Hophni and Phinehas, been about the same age as Samuel, what a risk the boy might have run of being robbed of his innocence by the defiling companionship of such vile and graceless scamps! The very difference in their ages would prove of itself a safeguard. There is nothing so surely contaminating as a wicked companion, on a level with ourselves in years, and therefore having so much in common with us by nature,—the elasticity, the eagerness of youth, the sympathies natural to early life, and the freedom of talk that comes more readily with equality in age. Nothing helps or hurts more than the companionships we form. How important, therefore, to be able to say with the Psalmist, 'I am a companion of all them that fear Thee, and of them that keep Thy precepts.'

But what is it that makes the enticement of sinners effectual? It is because there is something in ourselves that responds to the allurements of sin. It is attractive to us, otherwise the enticement of others would come to nothing. You may want to get your dog into the water for a swim, but, if the dog has a dislike to the water, he will resist all your blandishments. He may wag his tail, and bark in a friendly way, but he takes care to keep at a safe distance. Now, the danger for us lies in that we have, or are apt to acquire, a fondness for the water. After all, the only thing sinners can do is to open the way, to show us the way, and that is what the word translated 'entice' literally means. When an evil way is first shown us, there is something in us that would lead us to shrink from following it, but alas! there is something too that appeals to us and would lead us on.

What should we do, then, in the circumstances? Scripture gives a very concise and emphatic answer, a rule without exception, 'Consent thou not.' Why? It might be enough to reply, 'Because God says so.' You may be sure that it is for the best and most loving of reasons that He gives so definite a command. But, further, all experience teaches that you will be certain to regret it. No one ever yet found real gold at the foot of the devil's rainbow. Even the glamour passes away in time, and you are left at last with nothing but mists and the cold night. My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not.

Contributions and Comments.

'O Deus, ego amo Te.'

STUDENTS of hymnology will at once recognize these words as the first line of one of the sweetest hymns that have come down to us from the later mediæval Church (Daniel, *Thesaurus*, etc., ii. p. 335). It has been frequently ascribed to the Jesuit missionary Xavier, but, as the highest authorities are now agreed, on very inadequate evidence. It is much more probably the work of some pious monk of the sixteenth century, who was too glad to see his *suspirium amoris* pass into circulation, to care much for any literary reputation it might bring to his name. As compared with earlier mediæval hymns, it is somewhat faulty alike in symmetry and rhythm. But these defects are more than balanced by the very striking way in which it exhibits Christ's tender love to the souls of men and the all-absorbing love due to Him in return. It would almost seem as if the writer had had these words of the *Theologia Germanica* echoing in his heart: 'True love is taught and guided by the true Light and Reason, and this true eternal and divine Light teacheth Love to love nothing but the One true and Perfect Good, and that simply for its own sake, and not for the sake of a reward, or in the hope of obtaining anything, but simply for the Love of Goodness, because it is good and hath a right to be loved.' There are several good renderings of this hymn in existence, notably one by Father E. Caswall, which Dr. Schaff had the bad taste to mar by changes and additions of his own (*Christ in Song*, p. 483). In the following translation the idea of one or two lines has been slightly expanded in order to bring out more fully the writer's thought of the deep, disinterested affection which the love of the Lord is fitted to awaken in the heart of His redeemed:—

I love Thee, Lord, with all my heart,
  Not a mere refuge safe to win;
Nor yet that those who will not part
  From self, shall perish in their sin.

When all undone, Thou Saviour dear,
  Thou didst embrace me on the Cross;
For me wast pierced with nails and spear,
  For me didst suffer shame and loss;

And swelling waves of agony,
  And bloody sweat upon Thy brow:
Yea, death itself, and all for me,
  The sinner with the broken vow.

Why then, most faithful Lord of love,
  Should I not in my turn love Thee?
Not to make sure of heaven above,
  Or shun a lost eternity:

Not in the hope of rich reward,
  Or any guerdon yet to be;
But as Thyself hast loved me, Lord,
  With willing choice and favour free.

Yes: so I love Thee and will bring
  To Thee a love without alloy:
Only because Thou art my King,
  My Saviour God, my endless joy.

J. P. LILLEY.

Arbroath.

On Acts xv. 34 and xviii. f.

THE last number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES contains an article by Professor J. G. Tasker, 'The Western Text of the New Testament,' giving an excerpt from Professor Bousset's paper in *Theologische Rundschau*, i. p. 405 ff. As my own theory of the different forms in which the writings of St. Luke have come down to us is one of the main subjects of that paper, I may be allowed to make some remarks in my turn.

On the whole, Bousset's statement of the facts and the theories in question is quite fair and correct, and, up to a certain point, judicious. Unfortunately, when he comes to pronounce judgment upon my theory, these good qualities suddenly disappear. There are, he says, a great many passages in the Acts, in which the text of D and its associates (called β text) shows traces of later deliberate redaction. I have, according to him, wholly overlooked this host of passages. Now, as he gives but two instances, we must suppose that these two have been carefully selected, and that I have been guilty, in these at least, of gross inadvertence.

Before entering into the examination of these passages, I may say this much by way of preface. My theory rests upon two theses: (1) that the

additions of the β text are original parts of the work; and (2) that the common text of the Acts (α text) must come from the author himself. The first thesis was deduced from the general and almost invariable substance of the additions, which not only expand, but very frequently improve the text, by rendering it either more distinct and intelligible, or more vivid and emphatic; and, in the second place, from their thorough congruity with Luke's style and diction. My second thesis is due to the reflexion that no form of the Acts, if not authentic, could ever have acquired that almost universal acknowledgment which the common form did acquire. If both these theses are correct, it follows that St. Luke wrote his work twice, which is the solution of the problem given as early as J. Clericus. Bornemann, my predecessor in the present century, perceived the first of the two facts, namely, the equivalence, and even superiority of the β text, but failed to combine with it the second, and for that reason the whole of his theory is untenable.

As my first thesis covers so much ground, from the first chapter of the Acts down to the last, there may seem to be in that long line some weak points which might be attacked successfully. The first of Bousset's two passages is $15^{33\,f.}$: (Ἰούδας καὶ Σιλᾶς) ποιήσαντες χρόνον (ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ) ἀπελύθησαν μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστείλαντας αὐτούς. (34) ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σιλᾷ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ, μόνος δὲ Ἰούδας ἐπορεύθη. Ver. 34 is not found in the text of ℵBA, etc. but the first clause ἔδοξε . . . αὐτοῦ, being given by C and by a great many later manuscripts, has found access to both the German and the English Bible. Bousset takes no notice of this fact, and, more strangely still, has not looked into my two editions of Acts, but attacks me without knowing my position at all. I, too, have preserved the first part of v.34 in the common text, assigning to the β text only the words μόνος δὲ Ἰούδας ἐπορεύθη, which are given by D, and a few other witnesses, together with 34*a*, but are omitted by the majority even of witnesses preserving that first part. For the omission of 34*a* in ℵBA, etc., I give in my edition this explanation, that after ἀποστείλαντας αὐτούς an inadvertent copyist quite easily passed over the next clause, ἔδοξε . . . αὐτοῦ.

Now, Bousset, regardless of all this, goes on to argue that there was an interpolator who believed he perceived a gap in the narrative. According to v.33, Silas left Antioch, but in v.40 he reappears there (Παῦλος δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος Σιλᾶν κ.τ.λ.). 'Believed' is an inadequate expression; the gap is there, as soon as v.34 is omitted. I, therefore, have preserved 34*a* in my α text, in order to avert the blame from the author, and to lay it upon the copyists, whose infallibility is no dogma, and would be an absurd one. If this view of the case is true, there remains no difficulty for my theory. St. Luke, in the later edition of his work, was quite justified in omitting the second part of the verse. On the other hand, the interpolator proves to be an imaginary being, because no real interpolator would have taken the pains to keep within the limits of Luke's style, as the author of this verse has done. Ἔδοξε τῷ, with infinitive (see vv.22. 25. 28.; Luke's Gospel, 1[3]): nowhere in the N.T., except in St. Luke. The thing is deserving of some notice. The Letter of the Apostles and Elders (vv.23-29) is written in a more classical style than most parts of the Acts, and so is St. Luke's proem in comparison with the rest of his Gospel; one of these classical features is the ἔδοξε with this construction. Ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ (see 21[4]): ἐπιμένειν nowhere but in Acts and Paul, αὐτοῦ nowhere but in Acts, and once in Matthew (26^{36}, where ℵC* omit the word). Μόνος δὲ: cp. 8^{16}, μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον (μόνον or μόνος δὲ nowhere but in Acts, and once in Paul, Gal. 1^{23}). Ἐπορεύθη is rather common to N.T. authors. But Bousset says the whole verse is awkwardly attached to the one preceding. That is to say, a statement generally made in v.33 is partially denied in v.34. But long ago Lekebusch compared a very similar instance in $11^{29\,f.}$; v.29, 'They spoke to the Jews only'; v.30, 'Some of them spoke to Greeks too.' Bousset might have found that parallel in my commentary, together with the easy explanation that Silas changed his original purpose in that very assembly where he and his companions were to take leave of the congregation of Antioch.

Now to the other passage adduced by Bousset, which is chap. 18 f. He says that there the β text has: 'And (Paul) departed *from Aquila*,' the last two words being obviously intended to remove the ambiguity of the α text: 'He departed thence,' but that in this case the corrector did not read the context carefully, as the reference is not to a change in Paul's place of residence, but to his departure from the synagogue (1[4] to 8), a new place of teaching. I formerly took this view of the case myself, and my excluding the words ἀπὸ

τοῦ Ἀκύλα from my β text, has been described by Corssen as a *petitio principii*. My opponents maintain that all the variants found in the witnesses of β are to be judged in common; if in one case (out of many hundreds) the variant is proved to be an arbitrary correction, the same judgment is to be pronounced upon all the rest. Well, I have retracted my own judgment of this case, in a recent paper published in *Theolog. Studien und Kritiken* (1898, p. 539 ff.). The verse in question runs thus, according to α: καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν (that is, from the synagogue), εἰσῆλθεν (or ἦλθεν) εἰς οἰκίαν τινὸς ὀνόματι Τιτίου Ἰούστου, σεβομένου τὸν Θεόν, οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ. Εἰς οἰκίαν, not εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν; the contrast is between the synagogue and a house, and the article is not required, as it would be, if one definite house was contrasted with another. In D we have a large erasure at the beginning of the verse, a corrector having introduced the common reading instead of another, which is but partially legible. The word Ἀκύλα appears there, but whether there was μεταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ (so Kipling), or μ. δὲ ἀπὸ (so Scrivener), remains doubtful. Then, before ἦλθεν (so D), there are, as my friend, Professor Rendel Harris thinks, some faint traces of καὶ. The reading μεταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκύλα. καὶ ἦλθεν, would make the first four words a part of the preceding speech of Paul. Lastly, instead of οἰκίαν, D consistently gives τὸν οἶκον. The Latin Floriacensis (f) has: *et secessit* (=α) *ab Aquila et abiit in domum*, etc. Either text gives excellent sense: Paul declared his rupture with the Jews by changing not only his place of teaching, but also his private residence, moving from a Jew to a man of pagan origin, although a proselyte (σεβομένου τὸν Θεόν). The words οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ sufficiently indicate that he made the same house his place of teaching; but principally they mark the resoluteness and confidence of Paul's behaviour after the arrival of Timotheus and Silas, as opposed to his former timidity (v.[4] β, ἐντιθεὶς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ). So I think that this text is quite faultless; but do not think the same of the other: 'He went away from the synagogue and entered (εἰσῆλθεν or ἦλθεν, aorist) a private house, namely, that of Titius Justus, which joined hard to the synagogue.' In order not to go very far? or why? And what did he do when he entered the house? We supply, 'and taught his disciples there' (which is, in a manner, indicated by μεταβὰς ἐκεῖδεν. On that day only? Of course not, but he continued to do so. Could not Luke make this a little clearer? By dint of interpreting, the words μεταβὰς ἐκεῖδεν ἦλθεν εἰς οἰκίαν are made equivalent to 19[9] (Ephesus): ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητάς (καθ' ἡμέραν) διαλεγόμενος ἐν τῇ σχολῇ (Τυράννου). So α looks much like an intentional alteration of β, and the difficulty is, not to ascribe β to the author, but to ascribe α to him. Of my two theses (see above), the second is often harder to maintain than the first. Nevertheless, the intentional alteration of the passage may be safely ascribed to the author himself, who in the copy destined for Oriental congregations had reason to consider the feelings of the Jews, for Jewish converts formed a very considerable part of those congregations. So he intentionally made St. Paul's break with his former religious associates somewhat less conspicuous.

Lastly, Professor Bousset refers to some indefinite future critic, in case anybody would require more instances of arbitrary correction in β than these two. I dare to say I have shown that these two furnish no proof whatever against the β text; it is the α text which is more endangered. But that danger, too, cannot become very serious, because the external evidence for that text is so eminently strong. One word more. I never was so infatuated as to strive to convince those theologians who deny that St. Luke is the author of this book. If St. Luke did not write the book at all, it is self-evident that he did not write it twice.

F. Blass.

Halle, Prussia.

The Lord's Supper.

Is it strictly accurate to assert that the Lord's Supper was 'a transfigured Paschal Feast'? (see The Expository Times, September 1898, p. 551), and that 'the Paschal aspect of the Christian rite is primary'? For (1) the Synoptic writers, it is true, declare that Christ and His disciples ate the Passover together the night before He was betrayed: which was 14th Nizan. (2) But the writer of the Fourth Gospel declares that though there was a preparation, a washing of feet, and a supper, there was no previous Passover eaten by Jesus and the twelve.

These facts seem to indicate that the later Christian consciousness, of which the Fourth Gospel is the fruit, felt the desire to supersede the Judaic by the Christian rite; and that this was done by making the old simply a type of the new: the Paschal Lamb a type of Christ. 'The Paschal aspect of the Christian rite' is therefore not so much 'primary' as secondary. And St. Paul's words only bear this out: 'Our Passover hath been sacrificed, even Christ.' The same desire to separate the old from the new, as type and fulfilment, was a characteristic feature of St. Paul's theology.

The primary aspect of the Christian rite was the simple memorial feast. 'In remembrance of Me' is its keynote. Later thought was responsible for its coming to be regarded as 'a transfigured Paschal Feast.'

NORMAN MACLEOD CAIE.

Glasgow.

Matt. i. 4, 5; Luke iii. 32.

THE father of Boas is called Salmon (Σαλμαν) by almost all our authorities. But in Luke some ancient authorities write Sala (R.V. margin), and in Matthew have the two oldest forms of the Syriac version (the Curetonian and the Sinai-palimpsest) שלא, *i.e. Shela* or *Shila*. The very same form is found in the Syriac version of the Book of Ruth ($4^{20.\ 21}$), and lends great weight to the supposition of Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort that the Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, which, with the Ethiopic version, are our only authorities for Σαλα, have preserved the true form of the name for the Gospel of Luke, who was a Syrian from Antioch. Of the commentaries at my disposal, those of Holtzmann and Weiss do not even mention *Sala*, and C. Weizsäcker, in his translation, changed the name against all authorities into *Salma*. Plummer's *St. Luke* I have not seen as yet; is he more accurate than his predecessors? *Shela* occurs as the name of the father of Boas in the Schatzhöhle, 168^{13}, 223, 264. See the *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 4166, and supply *ibid.* col. 2644, the name *Salma*, ܫܠܡܐ, from 1 Ch 2^{11}.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

'The Palestinian Syriac Version.'

I GLADLY acknowledge the fairness of tone which characterizes Professor Nestle's last communication on the above subject. His additional remark on 2 K 2^{20} shows that he is not prepared to dissent from my view on the passage, for what he says agrees with the remarks made by me on pp. 11 and 33 of my *Palestinian Syriac Version*. With regard to my note on צביונא, I will only ask Professor Nestle and other scholars to treat my opinion on this point as a defensible hypothesis.

G. MARGOLIOUTH.

British Museum.

Job xix. 25–27.

IN the rendering which I venture to offer, my only departure from the Massoretic text is in reading נְקֻפוּ־זֹאת וָקָם instead of נְקֻפֵי־זֹאת in v.[26].

But I know that my Avenger liveth,
And that afterwards[1] He will arise[2] [for me] on the earth:
And after my skin is destroyed, then this [shall be]:
Then from my [restored] flesh I shall see God:
Whom I shall see for myself,
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another.[3]
My reins within me long[4] [for this].

R. M. SPENCE.

Manse of Arbuthnott.

The Germ of Astruc's Theory.

AFTER reading Professor Kennedy's articles on Jean Astruc in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. viii., I turned to one of my note-books and found this note on Gn 2: 'The chapter that went before is here repeted agayn (chapter summary to Matthew's Bible).'

Matthew's Bible, so called, is said to have been edited by John Rogers the martyr: Matthew being a fictitious name. In the *Cambridge Companion to*

[1] 'Afterwards,' אַחֲרוֹן; cf. Is 8^{23}, הָאַחֲרוֹן.

[2] 'He will arise,' יָקוּם; cf. Ps. 12^{5}, 'For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise (אָקוּם) saith the Lord.'

[3] I think the meaning is that Job's vindication by God would take place while he was yet alive, that it would not be left to 'another' to hear of it after he was gone.

[4] 'Long,' כָּלוּ; cf. Ps 84^{3}, 'My soul longeth' (כָּלְתָה); and Ps 119^{81}, 'My soul fainteth (same word) for Thy salvation: but I hope in Thy word.'

the Bible it is stated that 'Matthew's Bible is remarkable as containing a very large amount of marginal commentary and prefatory matter, derived to a great extent from Olivetan's French Bible (1535).' The idea naturally occurred, did Astruc find the germ of his theory in Olivetan?

I have since had an opportunity of seeing these old Bibles in the library of the British and Foreign Bible Society. In two editions of Matthew's Bible, both dated 1549, the above words occur as a chapter heading. In 1551 they were thus abridged: 'The chapter before is repeted again.' Turning next to Olivetan, I found the following as a marginal note to v. 4: 'Sõme des choses p̄dictes,' which Professor Kennedy has kindly interpreted for me thus: 'Summary of the matters mentioned above.'

It is clear then that some of the early Protestant translators had noticed the fact that the section commencing at chap. 2⁴ is in some sense a repetition of the previous section, though they do not appear to have pursued this discovery any further. And seeing that Astruc, though a Romanist, came of a Protestant family, it is almost certain that he must have been acquainted with Olivetan's work.

JAMES BROWN.

Ampthill, Beds.

Ben-ôni, Bin-yamîn.

GENESIS xxxv. 18.

THE youngest son of Jacob had a double name. The explanation how בִּנְיָמִין represents simply a Hebraizing of בֶּן־אוֹנִי is supplied in a remarkable fashion by an Edomite personal name of the Tel el-Amarna letters.

Last year (*Anc. Heb. Tradition*, p. 264, note 1) I already pointed out that *Bi-in-i-ni-ma* (Bin-in-îm), a form which appears in Winckler, No. 237 (L. 64), is a half-Egyptian variant of בִּנְיָמִין, since the Egyptian *wenem* corresponds to the Semitic ימן.[1] Even this is enough to make it very probable that in בֶּן־אוֹנִי there lies concealed a late and no longer intelligible form בֶּן־אוֹנִים, which in pronunciation agrees letter for letter with the monumentally transmitted *Bin-inîm*. If now, in addition to this, one considers that besides אוֹנָה, 'sorrow' (with suffix אוֹנִי, from which, by a popular etymology, בֶּן־אוֹנִי of Gn 35¹⁸ is explained as 'son of my sorrow'), also the plural אוֹנִים is found (Hos 9⁴, cf. also Dt 26¹⁴), the supposition becomes all the more plausible that בֶּן־אוֹנִים stood originally in the text of Gn 35¹⁸.

The modern pentateuchal criticism will of course reject this interpretation as it has done my interpretation of *Arpakshad* and *Pesakh*. But fortunately Egyptian-Semitic mixed forms, like *pa-ba'al*, *pa-Kana'an*, *Bin-inîm*, are established for the Mosaic era by the inscriptions, so that it will astonish nobody but the sceptics by profession if Gn 35¹⁸ is called by me as a new witness for the origin of Genesis in the age of Moses.

FRITZ HOMMEL.

Munich.

[1] Only the Pyramid texts still express 'to the right' by the root *yaman*, a word which has survived elsewhere only in the divine name *Amon*, and in the name for 'west,' *amenti* (properly 'lying to the right').

Union of the Divine and Human Natures in Christ.

THROUGH combination of the Divine and Human Natures when the Son of God became Incarnate, the problem of life, as it lay before Christ, assumed the highest complicated form. There naturally arose the danger either of His divine nature seeming to overshadow His human; or of His human nature appearing to circumscribe His divine. The danger only became the greater through the fact that He appeared as Fallen Man's Surety. A Being so composite subjected His character to the greatest possible strain.

Let us glance at a few of the more prominent necessities imposed on Him.

He must not for a moment cease to be God, and yet He must at all times be 'found in fashion as a man.' He must not for a moment resign one jewel in His crown, and yet He must descend into the lowest depths of humiliation. At one and the same time He must be possessed of divine and human attributes; the divine acting in concert with the human, and the human with the divine, and both acting in concert with the conditions of the mission He had come to fulfil. In Him there must be no sin, though 'on Him the Lord laid the iniquity of us all.' At one and the same time He must be the Son and the Servant of the Father;

the worshipped and the worshipper; King of kings, and yet Cæsar's subject; Ruler of His enemies, and yet a Captive in their hands.

How grandly Christ solved the problem of the life which was set before Him, and bore the strain which it imposed, we may learn from the judgments passed on Him in His own and succeeding generations.

So thoroughly were the two natures united, and so harmoniously did they blend, that it is often impossible to distinguish between their operations. So completely has He satisfied men of His humanity, that multitudes of keenest intellect have insisted that He was only a man; and yet so fully has He impressed others with the conviction that He was more than man, that from hosts of reluctant minds He has wrung the confession that He was 'a Son of God'; while the well-nigh universal voice of Christendom in all ages has been, 'This is *the* Son of God.' So lovingly did He 'carry our sorrows,' that in His own time, and ever since, He has been charged with human infirmities; and yet so unspotted was His life, that unrebuked He could give the challenge to the world, 'Which of you convicteth Me of sin?' So truly did He bear the sins of man, that, though God as well as man, He groaned under the load of suffering which these sins entailed; and yet so truly did He 'make an end of sins, and make reconciliation for iniquity,' that, though man as well as God, with latest breath He could say, 'It is finished,' and, though lifted on a cross, is 'drawing all men unto Him.'

In reading the Gospels, unwise attempts are often made to draw a sharp line between the action of His divine and human natures. Of course, in some instances, His human nature comes prominently out, and in other instances His divine; but in no case must the union of the two be lost sight of. At one period religious thought was largely concentrated on the contemplation of Christ's divine nature, while His human was left in the shade. Since then, there has been strong reaction; the pendulum of thought has swung in the opposite direction, and the man Christ Jesus has become the absorbing theme. Truth lies in the combination of both sides of Christ's nature.

Keeping hold of the inseparable union of both natures is a key to the proper understanding of certain passages in Christ's life which have often been misinterpreted. His sinlessness, for instance, has been called in question on the ground that on more than one occasion He gave vent to feelings incompatible with the idea of a perfect man. Have His accusers taken into account that He was God as well as man? Of course those who deny His Godhead cannot have done that. But there are many who accept His Godhead, who at the same time may forget its place and power. What Christ said and did, must be looked at through the medium of His twofold nature. Things in His life presenting one appearance when He is regarded simply as man, may present a very different appearance when He is thought of as also God. If in union with the soul, and through the soul of the man Christ Jesus, God was continually breathing, Christ's feelings as man must have been always in unison with His Godhead; and 'as for God, His way is perfect.'

The remembrance of the same union of Christ's natures, now that He has passed into the heavens, cannot fail to give us exalted and encouraging views of His sympathy with us. In thinking of that sympathy, it is natural and right to lay great stress on the fact that He is still man; that 'though now ascended up on high, He bends on earth a Brother's eye.' But what new sweetness and strength are seen flowing into this human sympathy, when we remember that the boundless ocean of divine almighty love is mingled with it. In repeating the words, 'He sympathises with our grief, and to the sufferer sends relief,' we acquire boldness and confidence when we call to mind that the sympathy expressed is that of God Incarnate.

GEORGE PHILIP.

Edinburgh.

'The Best Robe.'

THE R.V. has retained this translation of τὴν στολὴν τὴν πρώτην in Lk 15^{22}, and has not even suggested in the margin the possibility of a different translation, namely, 'the former robe.' The current commentaries, likewise, pass over this latter translation very slightly, if they mention it at all. Bernhard Weiss, for instance, has but the marginal note: 'To take it like *the robe which he used to wear formerly* (with Theophylact) is against v.[13].' This explanation, however, is not only to be found with Theophylact (in the eleventh century), but already in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, 2, 41 (p. 67, ed.

Lagarde), where we read: 'If a sinner is converted and shows the fruits of repentance, then receive him into prayer,' ὡς τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἀπολωλότα . . . ὁ φιλοτέκνος πατὴρ προσελάβετο, καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν στολὴν καὶ τὸν δακτύλιον καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα ἀποδοὺς (Cod. W, ἐπιδοὺς) ἔσφαξε, etc. And it is apparently supported by the *Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, which has אסטוליטא האי קמיתא. The other Syriac versions, rendering ריישיתא, seem to favour the common explanation (the first in degree, the best); but קד[מיתא is not so much *primaria*, *optima* (as it is translated in the *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 3497), as rather *prima* (Lk 2^2), or *prior* (Mt 27^{64}). That in New Testament Greek πρῶτος takes the place of πρότερος is generally known (comp. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 38, on Ac 1^1). Like as Rebekah has the goodly raiment of her elder son with her in the house, we may suppose that the loving father has kept a robe of his son while he was away, and as the king's daughters that were virgins were apparalled with special robes (2 S 13^{18}), so is the returning son clad again with the former robe, which he wore on festival occasions in the house of his father. I think this explanation ought to find more consideration than it has apparently found hitherto.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Two Disputed Hebrew Words in Familiar Passages.

1. בצר occurs in Job $22^{24.25}$, and in my commentary on the Psalms (1888, p. 393), I have conjecturally read בְּבִצְרֵי־כֶסֶף 'for pieces of silver ore,' where the Massoretic text has בְּרֹאשׁ־כ' (Authorized and Revised Versions, 'with pieces of silver'); similarly, Nestle (*Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, 1891, p. 151). Some have also found a bye-form בָּצָר, Job 36^{19}, but this view is now generally abandoned. According to Hoffmann (*Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, 1887, p. 48), ב means gold in the form of rings, such as were common in the earliest times. But the usual interpretation is 'pieces of ore broken off' (√בצר); this goes back to Abulwalid Ibn Janâḥ, who compares Ar. بَصْر, 'gold or silver from the mine.' But the ancients knew nothing of this (see Beer, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, p. 150).

2. תּוֹעָפוֹת also occurs in Job 22^{25}, where כֶּסֶף ת' is explained, 'silver in heaps,' or 'silver in bars.' Also in Nu 23^{22} 24^8 and Ps 95^4. These passages are more familiar to most of us than the oddly expressed passage in the speech of Elihu. Who does not remember the words—

> God bringeth them forth out of Egypt;
> He hath as it were the strength of the wild ox;

and the Psalmist's impressive, even if somewhat vague, utterance—

> The strength of the hills is His also?

But no satisfactory justification of this meaning has been given; indeed, the rendering 'heights,' supported in the Psalter, but not in Numbers, by LXX, seems to most moderns preferable. I venture to think that both renderings are purely imaginary. But, for the sake of clearness, let us give the passage of Job ($22^{24.25}$), which in M.T. contains both בָּצָר and תּוֹעָפוֹת, in a newly restored form—

וְאוֹצָרוֹת כֶּעָפָר תְּצַבּוֹר
וּפְחוֹל יָם אוֹפִיר׃
וְהָיָה שַׁדַּי נִזְרְךָ
וְכֶתֶר אוֹפִיר לָךְ׃

> [24] And thou wilt heap up treasures as the dust,
> Ophir-gold as the sand of the sea;
> [25] And the Almighty will be thy diadem,
> And a crown of Ophir-gold unto thee.

In $24a$, ושית על is corrupt; it has sprung from ואוצרות=וצותאר. In $24b$, ובצור should be taken over into $24a$; it is a corruption of תְּצַבּוֹר. The form of the phrase resembles that of Zec 9^{3b}. נחלים (as Budde has seen first) is כַּחוֹל יָם (נ and כ confounded). In $25a$, בצריך is a corruption of נִזְרְךָ (for the idea, cf. Is 28^5), and in $25b$ כסף is a corruption of כֶּתֶר, and תועפות (as Beer has already suspected) of אופיר. Corruption has also affected the text of all the other passages in which תּוֹעָפוֹת occurs. The only suitable meanings in Nu 23^{22} 24^8 are 'strength' (so Targum), or 'glory' (so LXX). 'Strength' is the basis of 'glory,' according to the Hebrew writers, so that these renderings are really synonymous. It is not improbable that LXX in Numbers read תפארת, which is one of the words rendered in this version by δόξα. In Ps 95^4, however, וְתוֹעֲפוֹת הָרִים לוֹ cannot mean 'and the glory of the mountains is His'; the only

possible meaning is 'and the glory (or, strength) of the wild ox is His.' It is true, this does not suit the context, but it was the habit of the editors of partly illegible passages (such as Ps 95^{4b} very likely became) to imagine a sense where they did not find one, by putting the legible or partly legible letters together, and gently manipulating them. I think that the original reading may have been something like this: וַיִּתְקַע בְּרִחֵי תֵבֵל, 'and he fastened the bars of the world' (cf. Jon 2^{7} [6], Job 38^{10}). This, when it became indistinct, the editor may have misread as וְלוֹ תוֹעֲפוֹת רְאֵם, the famous old passage in Numbers having already, in his copy of the Oracles of Balaam, become corrupt in one word. The LXX translator, therefore, had to guess a meaning, and rendered τὰ ὕψη τῶν ὀρέων. There is, I believe, one other passage of a Psalm in which Nu 23^{22} is probably quoted, but the discussion would be a difficult and abstruse one, and it would draw away the reader's attention from the comparatively plain and simple matters which I have brought before him. The discussion of ברצי כסף in the Massoretic text of Ps 68^{31} [30] I must also reserve. I believe the phrase to belong to v.^{32}, and that the true reading is בְּאוֹצַר כֶּסֶף, but to make vv.$^{31.\ 32}$ quite plain would hardly be possible without considering this by no means hopelessly difficult Psalm as a whole. I am sorry that Wellhausen has treated the passage respecting the 'Beast of the reed' and the 'calves of the people' so superficially. If the 'calves of the people' are allowed to remain, we need not wonder at 'Trample thou down the lovers of lies.' There is no doubt corruption in the line, but the single word which cannot be corrupt is כֶּסֶף, 'silver,' which is protected by v.^{29}. It surely ought not to have been altered into כָּזָב, 'lies'; while to be content with בְּרֹצֵי for בְּרַצֵּי is a piece of conservatism which I can hardly account for in such an acute critic as Wellhausen.

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

The Western Text of Acts.

The opinions which are quoted in Professor Tasker's interesting article in your last issue reinforce the position taken in my books and papers regarding Blass's theory. I, too, have 'endeavoured to prove that the language of the R. text often lacks the characteristics of Luke's style, whilst in many places it clearly bears the marks of a later recension' (see review of Blass in *Expositor*, 1897, p. 460; 1895, pp. 129, 212). The same explanation of the R. text of Acts 18^{7}, and the same inference therefrom, as are quoted from Professor Bousset, were stated in my *Church in Rom. Emp.* p. 158. That 'the peculiarities of the R. text are not likely to be accounted for, except as the work of an editor who was not the author,' is the view I have maintained from the first, and had contended for, before Professor Blass wrote on the subject. My view, however, has been, on the whole, a little more favourable to Blass. I have maintained, as regards a considerable number of passages, that the R. text is either the original Lukan, or points the way to it, but the A. text is in most of these cases non-Lukan; and Bousset similarly admits 'the possibility that in the R. text an original reading may sometimes be found.' But, apart from my being, perhaps, slightly more favourable to the R. text, the contention of Professor Bousset is the same that I have been upholding for six years. Further, I have maintained that the 'editor' makes additions which are almost always good and true in Asia, but often false in Europe.

W. M. Ramsay.

Aberdeen.

Entre Nous.

The *Record* of the 7th October announces that in its next issue there will begin a series of articles by Dr. Sinker, the librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, on 'The Higher Criticism: what is it? where does it lead us?' That is good news. Dr. Sinker is extremely conservative, but he is a scholar and a Christian. His articles will open the subject to genuine investigation, and, as the editor hopes, they will help some to view the position with more courage.

It is good news for the *Record*. With all our

love of the evangelical religion it was disappointing to find that the only disparaging review of the first volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* was printed in the pages of the *Record*. The disappointment was not on our own account, for the *Record* bore witness to the scholarship of the *Dictionary* as freely as any other review. But the volume had slipped into the hands of a man who was irreconcilably opposed to the criticism of the Old Testament, and the reason of his disparagement lay there. Now the truth is, that without the recognition of Old Testament Criticism, the *Dictionary* could not have been written. There are not scholars in existence to write it. Our business, as we conceive it, was to find for each subject the man who had made the deepest study of it. We could not have followed that principle, we could not have reached the scholarship which the *Record* itself gives us credit for, if we had first of all ruled criticism out.

The *Dictionary* has been well received. Not in this country only, but in Germany and America it has had a great reception—the reception for which we all worked hard, but which we scarcely dared anticipate. And besides the searching reviews, there comes constant evidence that the volume is in daily use. Men tell us that it is now at their elbow in the preparation of every sermon. At the recent Church Congress, Principal Robertson, of London, referred his hearers for the best discussion of the Acts of the Apostles to Mr. Headlam's very able article, and Professor Lock, of Oxford, quoted the book repeatedly by name.

Here is one of Professor Lock's references: 'It has become more evident that St. Paul's language is very often not primarily his own, but that he is taking up phrases, or even whole sentences, which have been uttered by the people to whom he is writing, or have been embodied in a letter from them. This is especially true of 1 and 2 Corinthians, because in this case we know that several letters had passed between St. Paul and Corinth. It is scarcely too much to say that the whole historical situation implied in 2 Corinthians has been so successfully reconstructed as to give an entirely fresh and more vivid interest to the letter (see Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, *s.v.* '2 Corinthians'); and I have elsewhere tried to show that the argument of 1 Cor. 8 is made much more clear if we suppose it to consist of a series of extracts from the Corinthian letter followed by St. Paul's comments upon them' (see the *Expositor*, July 1897).

Here again is an interesting quotation from the preface to the new edition of Dr. Plummer's *St. Luke*: 'This edition has also been improved by many small insertions, chiefly of references to books, which have either appeared, or have come to the writer's knowledge, since the first edition was published. First among these in importance is vol. i. of the new *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by Dr. Hastings, which should be in the hands of every biblical student. Three articles in particular may be mentioned, both on account of their excellence, and also of their helpfulness to the student of the Third Gospel: these are the articles on "Angels" (for this Gospel might be called the Gospel of Angels, so often does it mention these glorious beings); on the "Chronology of the New Testament"; and on the "Acts of the Apostles."'

The editors of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in their issue for October, draw attention to our remarks and to those of Dr. Driver in the *Expositor*, in regard to the attitude of that venerable quarterly, and proceed to explain and defend it. The explanation is that it was founded in 1844 by Professor Bela B. Edwards and Professor Edwards A. Park, of Andover, with the co-operation of Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, and Professor Edward Robinson, of Union Seminary, New York. It was founded as a representative of the 'New School Calvinism,' with liberalising tendencies in the interpretation of Scripture; but not too liberal. And the defence is that it has kept along these lines and keeps along them now. Well, we doubt it. Our impression is that the *Bibliotheca Sacra* is far more conservative now than it was when it was started.

'You may be glad to know,' writes Professor Ramsay, 'that I think I have established "the first census (of the system) ordered by Augustus" as a fact henceforth fundamental in ancient history, instead of being (as most thought) a fiction, or a mistake, on the part of St. Luke. The consequences are important in numerous ways. The dating by Quirinius is also established as highly probable, though not on the same footing of practical certainty as the "first census."'

We shall find the proofs in Professor Ramsay's forthcoming book: *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* which Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton announce as nearly ready.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is only a year or two since a student, returning from a course of study in Germany, said that there were only two English scholars whom he found accepted in Germany without reserve—Professor A. B. Davidson of Edinburgh and Professor H. M. Gwatkin of Cambridge. At the recent Church Congress Professor Gwatkin read a paper. It was scarcely heard then; it has absolutely been ignored since. But it seems to be the greatest of all the papers that were read at that Congress.

Its title is 'The Unrest of the Age.' It is a sufficiently general title to please us all. But Professor Gwatkin was not responsible for the guileless title; he was responsible for the searching words he uttered under it—words that we dare to say pleased nobody out and out. We give them on another page.

If there is a historical blunder in the New Testament, it is found in the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel. It is the census near the end of Herod's reign while Quirinius was governor of Syria (Lk 2^{1ff}). Some say it is more than a blunder, it is a pure invention. Strauss and Renan dismiss it contemptuously in a footnote. Yet St. Luke makes much to hang upon it. You cannot let it go and be as you were. The birth in Bethlehem of our Saviour hangs upon it. And St. Luke's credibility as a historian hangs upon it. In Professor Ramsay's words, if this is a blunder, it is a complication of blunders, the entire story must be relegated to the realm of mythology; and the writer who mistakes fable for fact, and tries to prop up his mistake by an error of the grossest kind, can retain no credit as an historical authority.

Professor Ramsay has written a book about it. He has written his book about this 'blunder' of St. Luke's, and nothing else. He reckons it worth a whole volume. And if he can dispose of the 'blunder,' if he can reassert the statement and restore St. Luke's credibility, we shall not grudge the space he occupies.

Professor Ramsay calls his new book *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (Hodder & Stoughton, crown 8vo, pp. 280, 5s.). For that is the root of the matter. If Christ was born at Bethlehem, St. Luke states the fact, and the time and circumstances may be a blunder, but they are not an imposture. If Christ was not born at Bethlehem, then St. Luke was credulously imposed upon as to that and all the circumstances surrounding it, or else he has cruelly imposed upon us.

St. Luke's statement, according to the translation of the Revised Version, reads in this way: 'Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria. And all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judæa, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and family of David; to enrol himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child.' Now the misstatements here are said to be many. Cæsar Augustus had not the control of *all the world*, and could not issue such a decree; even if the Roman world is meant, Palestine was governed by a native king, and Augustus would never have set aside his jurisdiction; but no such enrolment ever did take place; and in particular, Quirinius was not governor of Syria when Christ was born, but quite another man. It is a smaller matter that men would not have been sent all over the world to be enrolled in their native city, but would have been enrolled where they lived; or that in any case their wives would never have had to go with them.

We must face these difficulties. They are real. To many they are decisive. And we must face them honourably. The harmonist at all hazards is an enemy to the cross of Christ. Professor Ramsay handles them separately, and, so far as we can see, fairly. First, he points out that in several places St. Luke uses the term 'world' when he means the Roman Empire only. Thus Demetrius spoke of the State-goddess Diana, 'whom all Asia and the world worshippeth'; and Paul and Silas were accused before the magistrates of Thessalonica because they had 'turned the world upside down.' In both cases the outside barbarians were absent from the speakers' thoughts. How much more would Augustus, in giving orders for a census or enrolment of the empire, ignore the parts of the earth that were beyond his sway, and calmly speak of the whole world. Then it is demonstrable that Palestine, though governed by a dependent king, was at this time reckoned part of the Roman Empire and liable to enrolment. Strabo and Appian, more carefully read, have put that fact beyond dispute. But we face a greater difficulty when we are told that no record exists of a census of the whole Roman world having been made at this time.

Let us face it. Professor Ramsay bids us look at the language first. St. Luke does not say that a single census of the Roman world was ordered. He uses the present tense (*ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην*). He means that Augustus ordered enrolments to be regularly made. What Augustus did was to lay down the principle of systematic enrolment. And then, when he has stated that, St. Luke proceeds to say, 'This was the first enrolment, when Quirinius was administering Syria; and all persons proceeded to go for enrolment each to his own city.' But *was* there a system of periodic enrolment in Palestine at this time? There was. At least there was in Egypt. And the presumption is so strong that it prevailed in Palestine also as to reach a practical certainty.

It is the discovery of this momentous fact that gave Professor Ramsay the occasion to write his book. Recently three different scholars announced about the same time, and independently of one another, the discovery that periodic enrolments were made in Egypt under the Roman Empire. These were Mr. Kenyon of the British Museum in the *Classical Review* for March 1893; Dr. Wilcken in *Hermes* for 1893, p. 203 ff.; and Dr. Viereck in *Philologus*, 1893, p. 219 ff. We do not need to go into these discoveries minutely here, or into the subsequent confirmation of them. It is enough to say that they place the fact of periodic enrolments in Egypt beyond question, and that these enrolments were called by St. Luke's word, *Apographai*. They were an enrolment or numbering of the population according to households, and were quite distinct from the valuation

for taxing purposes, which used to be considered the only proper kind of Roman census.

That alters the situation. No such discovery has yet been made for Syria. But such enrolments did actually exist: St. Luke has not invented them. And, further, it is extremely improbable that he had extended to Syria what was confined to Egypt. It is not in the least likely that he knew anything about Egypt or its enrolments. There is also positive evidence that in Syria itself such enrolments were made. In particular, there is the evidence of an inscription, once condemned by Mommsen, but now, through the discovery in Venice of the other half of the stone, found to be genuine, that when Quirinius was governor of Syria (and almost certainly when he was governor *first*) an enumeration or enrolment was made of the province of Apameia.

Now these enrolments were periodical. And working back by periods of fourteen years from those known to have taken place later, we find that the first enrolment in Syria occurred in the year 8–7 B.C. But there is reason to believe that in Herod's jurisdiction the enrolment was not actually carried out for at least a year later. Herod might have escaped it altogether, for it was a risk to make it in Judæa; but he fell under the displeasure of Augustus at this time. In B.C. 8 according to Schürer, or B.C. 7 according to Lewin, Augustus wrote a letter to Herod informing him that whereas he had hitherto regarded him as a friend, henceforth he would treat him as a subject. The first-fruits of that letter was probably the order that the enrolment should go on. Herod would send an embassy to Rome, and thus the year or more would be consumed before it actually was made. There is good reason to believe that the enrolment took place in the late summer of the year 7 or the year 6 B.C.

Now Professor Ramsay points out that in the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE the conclusion is reached that the birth of Christ took place in the year 6 B.C. Starting from a different point of view, and working on utterly diverse lines, Mr. Turner, in his article on the 'Chronology of the New Testament,' has reached the same result as Professor Ramsay. And at the last moment Professor Paterson reminds Professor Ramsay that the result which both have attained agrees with the celebrated calculation of Kepler as to the star of the Wise Men.

There remains the difficulty of the governorship of Quirinius. Quirinius administered Syria from A.D. 6 to 9, and during that administration there occurred a great census or valuation of property in Palestine. Obviously the incidents described by St. Luke are irreconcilable with that date. But Quirinius had administered Syria at some previous time. Mommsen considers that the most probable date for his first government of Syria is about B.C. 3 to 1. Neither does that agree with the date which Professor Ramsay has found probable for the enrolment of Palestine and the birth of our Lord. And in the year B.C. 6 it is certain that Quirinius was not governor of Syria. Quinctilius Varus was governor then.

But does St. Luke say that Quirinius was governor of Syria? Our English versions translate him so. But his own word is 'acting as leader' (ἡγεμονεύοντος). Now at another time Vespasian conducted a war in Palestine while Mucianus was governor of Syria, on which Palestine was dependent. Tacitus styles Vespasian *dux*, the Latin word which exactly corresponds with St. Luke's ἡγεμών. History tell us that before the death of Herod, Quirinius was engaged in a war which had to do with the foreign relations of Syria. In short, Professor Ramsay comes to the conclusion that in B.C. 6 Varus was controlling the internal affairs of Syria as Proconsul, while Quirinius was commanding its armies and directing its foreign policy as a lieutenant of Augustus (*Legatus Augusti proprætore*). Whereupon St.

Luke accurately states that the first periodic enrolment of Palestine took place while Quirinius was 'acting as leader' in Syria.

The foregoing is a short and altogether inadequate account of the chief matter in Professor Ramsay's new book. But the book contains other matters besides that. And before leaving it we shall touch on one of these.

It is St. Luke's attitude towards the Roman world. St. Luke, as Professor Ramsay reminds us, though in essentials a Paulinist, yet differed from St. Paul in one important respect. St. Paul was a Roman, he was a Greek. It is true that St. Paul was a citizen of Tarsus, and from that point of view a member of the Greek world. But his Roman citizenship overrode his Greek citizenship. From infancy he had been educated to understand his position as a Roman. St. Luke was not a Roman. Like the rest of the Greeks, he never quite understood Roman matters. The mystery of the Roman names puzzled him. He never even tells us what St. Paul's Roman name was. There is no doubt that St. Paul had a Roman name. As a Roman citizen, he was bound to have a Roman name. By his Roman name—Gaius Julius Paullus or something of that style—he revealed his Roman citizenship to the magistrates at Philippi and to Claudius Lysias. By his Roman name he appealed to Cæsar. But St. Luke does not feel the mystery of its majesty, and never tells us what it was.

Thus St. Paul had as it were an advantage over St. Luke, in being a Roman. He had also an advantage in being a Jew. To St. Paul the distinction was vivid between Roman, Greek, and Jew; to St. Luke the only valid distinction was between Jew and Gentile. When he writes, he writes for Gentiles. He is not conscious of their separation into Greeks and Romans; he is only conscious that they are not Jews. Accordingly he carefully explains customs that are purely Jewish, and describes localities that only a Jew would be familiar with. He tells the distance of Emmaus and the Mount of Olives from Jerusalem, but he thinks that the coasts of the Ægean Sea need no explanation. He even silently inserts a Gentile custom in place of a Jewish one when it would be more intelligible to his Gentile readers.

Professor Ramsay's example is in the Gospel. In Mk 2^{1-4} we have an account of the way in which a man sick of the palsy was laid before Jesus. 'And when they could not come nigh unto Him for the crowd, they uncovered the roof where He was (literally, they unroofed the roof); and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay.' To St. Mark's Jewish readers that was quite intelligible. The house was a humble one, with a flat roof of earth or other material, which was easily destroyed and as easily replaced. The bearers took advantage of this. Mounting on the roof, they broke it up, and let down the couch through the hole which they thus made.

But without elaborate explanation St. Luke's hearers would not have understood this. Their houses were constructed differently. They were covered with tiles, and had a hole (*impluvium*) in the roof of the principal chamber (*atrium*), the chamber where the company would be assembled. St. Luke does not stay to explain. He does not think it necessary to turn aside from his proper subject to describe differences of architecture. He simply represents the house as if it were a Gentile one, the roof tiled and the opening ready. 'And not finding by what way they might bring him in because of the multitude, they went up to the house-top, and let him down through the tiles with his couch into the midst before Jesus (Lk 5^{19}).

'For some years the conviction has been spreading and deepening, in the minds of those best qualified to form an opinion on the subject, that in both systematic and apologetic theology there

is room and need for a revision of principles and methods, and for, at least, a tentative effort towards a restatement of religious doctrine and belief.' And Principal Hodgson makes the 'tentative effort' in his new book *Theologia Pectoris* (T. & T. Clark, pp. 207, 3s. 6d.).

It is the freedom of the religious life that has made the restatement necessary. The old theology was adapted to an age when it could be said, as Bacon said in his age, 'If we proceed to treat of theology, we must quit the barque of human reason, and put ourselves on board the ship of the Church, which alone possesses the divine needle for justly shaping the course.' That age has passed away for Principal Hodgson. In the new age, not only the Church, but every other external thing is losing its authority. There are few teachers, Dr. Hodgson thinks, who would now endorse the assertion of Dr. Chalmers that 'the authority of every revelation rests exclusively upon its external evidences.' To Dr. Hodgson just the opposite of that statement is the truth now. Objective facts there must be, but so long as they are only objective they possess no value for us and carry no obligation. The facts and events of sacred history are indispensable for the suggesting of the ideas and doctrines of Christian teaching. But they carry significance and value only in so far as we are able to interpret and receive them.

Therefore our systems of theology have hitherto begun wrong. They used to begin with the doctrine of God. More recently they have begun with the doctrine of Christ. Both are wrong. They ought to begin with the doctrine of man. It is the nature, condition, and needs of man that determine his theology.

And undoubtedly Dr. Hodgson's way is the biblical way. Whatever be claimed for systematic theology, biblical theology has always to do with man. Go back as far as we are allowed to go in the history of God, and we find Him thinking of man. He is thinking of man all through the record of revelation. This does not mean that apart from man's thought of God, God has no existence. Dr. Hodgson does not mean that. He believes in the miracles of Jesus. He does not say that these miracles have no place in history and no place in fact unless we believe them. But he does say that the miracles of Jesus, as well as Jesus Himself and the God and Father of Jesus, owe their value to us altogether to our need of them.

It is only when we see that biblical theology begins with man that we can discover the worth of some of its most precious portions. As long as the Prologue to St. John's Gospel is looked upon as a theological statement—part of a doctrine of God—we leave it outside. And then the words of the third verse, 'All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that hath been made,' are so much accurate theological formula, without spirit and without life. But when we see that the creation was the creation of man. When we learn that even the whole world was made for man and not man for the world, and that Christ's interest in the creation was His interest in man, then we discover that this theological statement carries intimate vital lessons to us.

For if all things were made by Him, we can see first of all that He knows the make of them. Then when He came to the earth it was easy for Him to walk on the water. We cannot do so. We do not even know that we cannot do so till we try. We do not know the make of water. But He knows; and He knows just what is necessary to give it the power to support a human body.

Again, when Christ appears on earth He knows exactly what He has come to do. For He had made man in His own image. He knows then how much of that image man has lost, how much has to be done to restore it. He comes into the world to be a redeemer. That is the very end of His coming, and His aim is as definite as His end. He knows exactly what to do.

47,325

He comes to restore to man the image in which he was made, His own image. So He offers that image as the example. They are not wrong who tell us that Christ is the great example; they are wrong only when they tell us He is no more. He is the great example. We must be conformed to His image in all things. And that is the very first thing that Christ offers us. 'The law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.'

And then He uses the means whereby we may be conformed to His image. The means is love—love in action. Having loved His own that were in the world, having loved them indeed before they came into the world, for it was His love that brought them in, He loves them to the end. And greater love hath no man than this that a man should lay down his life.

A few weeks ago there appeared in *The Christian World* a letter from a 'Pastor' under the heading, 'An Anxious Enquiry.' 'May I ask my brethren in the ministry what their experience has been of the effects of the preaching of the gospel of the Fatherhood? I was converted under a gospel of "terrors," and used to preach it myself, but for ten years have discarded it in favour of the more tender and, to me, reasonable message, but I find it appeals only to the few. Somehow it does not lay hold of the masses like the older, even harder, gospel. To me it is the true gospel, but what am I to do in face of the failure of it to lay hold of men savingly? I am perplexed, humbled, and pained. I long to see souls saved, but though crowds come to hear, yet apparently I have no power in my gospel to save.'

Next week there appeared four replies. The first was from the Rev. T. Rhondda Williams of Bradford, whose new book has been the occasion of our turning to this matter. That letter we shall consider in a little. The second was signed 'Fifty Years a Teacher.' 'The letter you publish from "Pastor,"' said this teacher, 'is one I should like to see discussed, for it is my own difficulty. I was converted fifty years ago under what he calls the gospel of terrors, and discarded it as he did. I have taught constantly and done my best with children, but though I can see some good, it seems to me there was something stronger and better about the old Puritans and the Christians I can remember, and more converts were made then.'

The third letter was signed by the Rev. J. P. Perkins of Worthing. '"Pastor's" inquiry about the preaching of the Fatherhood,' said Mr. Perkins, 'is a very serious one. I, too, firmly believe in the universal Fatherhood of God, but it is a doctrine for Christians, and not for converting men from sin to holiness.' And then he said that in his ministry of twenty-three years he had found that the most potent truths for conversion are the exceeding sinfulness of sin, the full and effectual atonement provided by the Lord Jesus on the Cross (which he describes in a parenthesis as 'Christ and Him crucified' without fear of the charge of 'Paulinism'), and finally the emphatic declaration of the necessity and power of the Holy Ghost for conversion, sanctification, and effective work for God. The last writer, who was nameless, said: 'In reply to "Pastor" of last week, I may say I also have for some time preached "the gospel of the Fatherhood," but without visible results. Last Sunday I resolved to try the old gospel of terror (so-called), and the result was a genuine, open, old-fashioned conversion.'

The following week this last letter was directly dealt with by the Rev. John A. Hamilton, M.A., of Penzance. Mr. Hamilton described the writer as 'a grim humorist.' The writer seemed to say that he *believed* in the universal Fatherhood of God, but finding it did not produce conversions, he *preached* 'the old gospel of terror.' Mr. Hamilton does not suppose any man would do that and avow it. To do that even without avowing it would show us, says Mr. Hamilton, to be sons of Gehenna and to make sons of Gehenna. It would be to misrepresent, calumniate, blaspheme

God in our anxiety to make an instant impression. And so he calls the writer a grim humorist, and thinks that the full severity of his satire may not be at once and to everybody apparent.

Mr. Hamilton's letter is most appropriately followed in the same issue by one from the Rev. G. P. M'Kay of Leigh. 'As it is confessedly found by some that there is not much converting power in the doctrine of God's universal Fatherhood, it might be well,' says Mr. M'Kay, 'for those who have embraced that doctrine to inquire *whether it is true*'—the italics being his own. Mr. M'Kay does not believe that it is true. He holds that 'by their fruits ye shall know them' applies to doctrines as well as to men. The fruit of this doctrine is indifference; for if all are already children of God, *without* faith in Jesus Christ, the point is gone from the rousing appeal, 'Ye must be born again.' He thinks that the universal Fatherhood is bound up with universal salvation. For if all are children of God, all are partakers of the Divine nature; then all must live as long as the universal Father lives, and all must live with the Father, for the heart rebels against the teaching that any of them will live for ever in hell. 'I, for one, believe,' says Mr. M'Kay, 'that such preaching accounts for much of the "dry-rot" of the present-day pulpit.'

But in the same issue there is a third letter. It is signed by the Rev. Ebenezer Davis of Old Charlton. Mr. Davis finds nothing wrong in preaching the universal Fatherhood of God; what he finds wrong is the looking for conversions. It is not a little significant, he says, that the very term 'conversion' disappears from the Revised Version, which has in its place 'turned' or 'turning.' Were the Twelve converted, he asks, when they were called by Christ? He does not find that either Christ or the apostles ever manifested 'that feverish anxiety for the "conversion" of their hearers so characteristic of modern evangelists.' And then he puts his doctrine on the subject into a single pregnant sentence, when he says, it is an assumption that none but the converted are saved, and that unless converted in the few and evil days of this brief life men are hopelessly lost.

Only another letter appears. It is in the next issue; it is unsigned; and it adds nothing to the matter. But the letter of Mr. Rhondda Williams, which we passed over in its place, comes in here. For Mr. Williams considers that the ordinary doctrine of God's Fatherhood and the ordinary preaching of conversion are equally wrong. What does a 'Pastor' mean by 'saving souls'? Surely he has made some men good; surely he has helped some men to the true religious life. 'Do the crowds who come to hear him preach go away time after time without feeling any uplifting influence, without catching sight of the higher visions of life, without knowing anything of the pull of the divine power? Does he neither strengthen nor beautify any character, and does he minister no comfort and consolation? If so, his ministry is indeed a failure, and it is time to be more than anxious. But if he does these things, does he not *save*?'

Thus Mr. Williams objects to the popular conception of conversion, or of saving souls. But he objects yet more to the popular preaching of the Fatherhood. In the revolt against what is called a gospel of terrors, many, he says, ascribe to God a Fatherhood which no father on earth would find sufficient for the training of his family. The love of God is often expounded as if it were mere softness of heart. But there is sternness in God that He may be feared. Our own moral nature, as well as the evolution of history, testify that it was no mistake that long ago declared 'Our God is a consuming fire,' and 'It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.'

But the question remains, and it is after all *the* question: Is the universal Fatherhood of God a fact? That question is only once touched in these letters. But Mr. Rhondda Williams has just published a volume of sermons through Mr. Horace

Marshall (*Belief and Life*, 3s. 6d.), and in that volume he directly answers it. He says that St. Paul and St. John do not preach the universal Fatherhood of God, but Jesus Christ does.

Mr. Williams says that St. Paul and St. John (he means the New Testament writers generally outside the Gospels) do not preach and do not hold the doctrine that God is the Father of all men. To them the phrase, 'sons of God,' or 'children of God,' describes an acquired character. It denotes something that does not belong to all men as such. St. Paul says that 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.' He tells the Galatian Christians, 'For ye are all the children of God, *through faith in Christ Jesus*.' To St. Paul even Jesus was not *born* the Son of God. He was 'born of the seed of David according to the flesh,' and 'determined to be the Son of God in power, according to the spirit of holiness.' With St. Paul's teaching St. John agrees. 'As *many as received Him*, to them gave He power to become the sons of God.' And in his first epistle St. John makes a distinction between 'the children of God' and 'the children of the devil,' saying also that 'whosoever doeth not righteousness' must not be counted among the children of God, nor 'he that loveth not his brother.'

But Mr. Williams holds that Christ teaches that we are all the children of God. He admits the distinction between 'the children of the Kingdom' and 'the children of the wicked one.' He admits that Jesus called one man 'the son of perdition,' and that He once denounced the people before Him as 'the offspring of vipers.' He admits that one passage 'gives Him' these words: 'If God were your Father, ye would love Me; but ye are of your father the devil.' He admits that in the Sermon on the Mount He blessed the peacemakers and said, 'For they shall be called the children of God.' And yet he holds that 'the universal Fatherhood of God is distinct enough in much of His teaching.'

He finds it in two places. The first is the phrase 'that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven.' He has already quoted that phrase as proof that a certain *character* is needed if they would be children of God. Now he says that God is spoken of as being *already* their Father, though they are to *become* His children. The other place is the parable of the Prodigal Son. 'In the immortal parable of the Prodigal Son, the fatherhood and sonship continue through all the story of sin.'

The Unrest of the Age.

By Professor H. M. Gwatkin, D.D., Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Cambridge.

Unrest like that of our time is not a new thing in history, but one familiar to every student. We see it in the age of Isaiah, when the Assyrian was breaking up the primeval kingdoms of Asia; and again in the times of Pericles, when the old beliefs of Athens were unsettled. We see it on a great scale in our Lord's time, when the ancient world of nations was melting down into the Roman Empire; and not less clearly four hundred years later, when the Empire itself was dissolving into a new world of nations. The sixteenth century was profoundly stirred by the restoration of learning, the discovery of America, and the reformation of religion; and that again was an age of unrest. There is deep unrest in every age of change; and how shall we escape, on whom revelations of God in history and science have come with such bewildering rapidity?

'His way is in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of His feet.' Is it

strange that a mighty tempest should be stirred up round about Him to destroy the spiritual stagnation which is the delight of the natural man? Revelation and revolution are never far apart in history; for nations as well as men must earn their beliefs in the sweat of their brow. It is good that unbelief should be driven out from its hiding-places of respectability and formal orthodoxy to face the eternal questions of life, and vainly seek an answer that is not in Christ. Then it grows blatant in its twin forms of scepticism and superstition. The one cries defiance to God's message; the other may seem to receive it, but only on the authority of some worthless word of men. The two are one in having no genuine and personal belief in it.

Yet let us do them justice. Unrest, indeed, is always unbelief; and thousands who fancy they have scruples are only cherishing some sin that blinds them. Scruples forsooth! which are no more than floating doubts they never have the manliness to examine. Yet unrest often has a nobler element of real bewilderment; for God teaches hard lessons, as when He calls the Gentiles, or the northern nations, or the outcasts of England; and sometimes again men's wrath is kindled by some caricature of things divine, which Christ hates more than they. Unrest is the sinner's answer to some new message from heaven which he cannot or will not understand, yet dares not ignore; and therefore it is a sure sign that, with all our sins and shortcomings, we are still a living nation. The unrest of stirring England is better than the deadly slumber of a Catholic Church of Latin sectarianism. Less havoc is made of spiritual life by the clattering scandals of our noisy sects and parties than by the organized falsehood of an unspiritual unity.

The unrest of our time is essentially religious, for political questions depend on social, and social on religious. Thus the reconstruction of society depends on the reconstruction of religion; and that is a work we shall have to do from the foundation, as it was done in the time of Athanasius. No change was made in doctrine then, and none is needed now. For seventy years and more the keenest of intellects have been fighting round our Bible, and sifting every word of it as never book was sifted yet: and their labour has not been thrown away. Though much has come to light, and many of our old ideas are for ever shattered, Christ our Saviour's Person stands exactly where it stood before, but rooted in history and nature far more deeply than our fathers knew. We see the Son of Man with a vivid clearness never vouchsafed in past ages; yet He is none the less the Son of God adored by them of old. Neither do our Articles and Liturgy need serious revision. So far as doctrine goes, no Church can face the future with a clearer conscience than our own. We have no lying infallibility to recant, no questions of learning decided by councils of ignorance, no Creed of Pope Pius to repent of in sackcloth and ashes. We need no new doctrine to put new vigour into life and thought and character; only a more intelligent and earnest dealing with the old. We need only to realize and fully make our own in something of its world-wide range and meaning the idea of God which illuminates all Christian doctrine. The difference of Athanasius from Arianism is the difference of the Gospel from Mohammedanism; and that difference needs asserting now. Its assertion by Athanasius was the deathblow of despotisms and the raising of nations from the dead, though his work has been obscured for ages by the saint-worship and church-worship which obscured our Lord's true manhood and true divinity in East and West alike. Its assertion in our time will give peace and new life in our restless Churches, for the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation are not conundrums of the dogmatists, but a perpetual witness to the most practical fact of the universe—that God's nature is no inscrutable mystery of arbitrary power and will, but an open secret of holiness which men by truth and purity can in their measure truly see and understand. There is a great deal yet to be done to root out the Mohammedan conception of God, which Calvin took over (with some other unamiable teachings) from the Latin Church. That idea of God as a despot in heaven fosters despotism, lawlessness, and superstition on earth, and brutalizes government, society, and religion together. Now, however, a nobler doctrine shines on us with a light which neither the Fathers nor the Reformers ever fully caught; and in this is the answer to our questionings, and the cure for the hatreds of race and the hatreds of class which threaten to wreck the whole structure of civilization.

Now, what can we do as Christ's ministers to quiet the unrest around us? We can do a great deal, for we are listened to quite as much as we

deserve; though I fear that many of us are not worth listening to—men who take up what they are pleased to call beliefs on mere authority—beliefs for which they never laboured, and for which they do not even care to render a reason. We can at least point men steadily away from the trifles to the decisive question. Of those who say that religion is all reason, some reject the gospel because it is not all reason, while others who seem to receive it evaporate it into formalism and orthodoxy; and the two extremes are one in unbelief. Of those who make religion all feeling, some stumble because the gospel is not all feeling, while others who seem to receive it evaporate it into sentimentalism and excitement; and the two extremes are one in unbelief. We can show our people that faith is neither reason nor feeling, but includes both in a personal relation to Christ which calls for all the powers of the whole man. Those powers need not be great, but we must use them for ourselves and not by deputy, and in the fullest range of heart and soul and mind. So shall we find rest in the midst of unrest, as we have truth and purity to look through the revolution around us to the revelation of our Father's love which guides its course.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

As already intimated, the subjects of study for the session 1898–99 are the First Book of Psalms (Psalms i.–xli.) and the First Epistle of St. Peter.

Those who desire to study one or both of these portions of Scripture between November 1898 and June 1899 are invited to send their name and address to the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. There is no fee or other obligation. The purpose of the Guild is to encourage systematic study of Holy Scripture as distinguished from the mere reading of it, and the conditions are made as simple as possible. The best commentary available should be used. There are excellent editions of both books in the 'Cambridge Bible for Colleges.' And if the member can study the Hebrew and Greek, he will know that Delitzsch's (Hodder & Stoughton) or Cheyne's *Psalms* (Kegan Paul) are scholarly and suggestive, while an edition of a portion of St. Peter by the late Professor Hort has just been published by Messrs. Macmillan.

Students are invited to send short papers as the result of their study, and the best of these papers will be published, one at least every month if found suitable. And the writers will be asked at the end of the year to select a volume out of a list which Messrs. T. & T. Clark will furnish.

NEW MEMBERS.

Rev. W. Lansdell, 33 Clive Street, Shelton, Stoke-on-Trent.

Rev. W. Callahan, Curate of Pateley Bridge, Leeds.

Rev. Thomas R. Lewis, Rastrick, Brighouse.

Rev. James M'Kenzie Campbell, M.A., Free Church Manse, Lochgoilhead.

Rev. Donald Matheson, M.A., The Manse, Briar Walk, Putney, London, S.W.

Rev. Arthur S. Langley, Newcastle, Staffordshire.

Rev. John MacBeth, M.A., B.D., Newton Manse, Dalkeith.

Rev. L. L. Barclay, M.A., B.D., 79 City Road, Norwich.

Rev. A. C. Boorman, 39 Ladbroke Road, Redhill, Surrey.

Rev. C. C. Leader, Burton Latimer, near Kettering.

Rev. John Watt, M.A., Duff Cottage, Calcutta.

Rev. W. Tassie, The Manse, Taree, New South Wales.

Rev. R. W. Washbourne, B.D., Ph.D., Methodist Episcopal Church, Pittstown, New York.

Mr. Henry Parrott, St. James Villa, Farnborough.

Rev. Edward Dunstan, Potchefstroom, South African Republic.

Rev. James Andrew M'Lellan, The Manse, Tarnagulla, Victoria.

Rev. Andrew James Forson, Morison Church, Dundee.

Mr. Charles Greig, Ridstone, Victoria Road, Peelcauseway, Cheshire.

Rev. E. Wickliffe Davies, B.M., 9 Church Street, Ton Pentre, R.S.O., South Wales.
Rev. A. W. Woolverton, A.K.C., 17 Sylvan Grove, Old Kent Road, London, S.E.
Rev. F. Thornton Gregg, 35 Lancaster Road, Brighton.
Mr. Robert Johnston Moffett, B.A., University Settlement, 10 Possil Road, Glasgow.
Rev. W. Turner, M.A., Blacktoft Vicarage, Howden.

The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual.

By Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Aberdeen.

VII. Purity and Impurity.

The sins for which punishment was inflicted by the god are closely connected with the difficult subject of purity and impurity. In several cases at Dionysopolis the chastisement is inflicted, not for a positive sin, but for entering on the service of the god[1] in a state of impurity, or even approaching the temple or the holy village beside the temple in that state. It is an important question whether the idea of purity was taken to mean mere ceremonial purity, or included also purity of life and heart. According to Monsieur P. Foucart, one of the first authorities as regards ancient ritual, there is in none of the inscriptions anything implied except material physical purity,[2] but the inscriptions of Asia Minor show distinctly that this is too sweeping a statement. When Xanthos says, 'May the god be propitious to those who approach him simply' (*εὐείλατος γένοιτο τοῖς ἁπλῶς προσπορευομένοι[ς ὁ θεός]*, he describes the frame of heart suitable for worshippers; they are to come in a single-hearted way, without any other intention hidden in their heart (as James' 1^5 speaks of *τοῦ δίδοντος Θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος*). He is expressing the same thought which prompts the regulation in another case that no one shall enter the society of the worshippers (*ἐρανισταί*) who is not pure, pious, and good (*ἁ[γν]ός, εὐσεβής, ἀγ[αθ]ός*). It is quite true, as M. Foucart points out, that *ἀγαθὸς* is constantly used in the inscriptions of the *eranistai*[3] to indicate one who has rendered service to the *eranos* or the god, and *εὐσεβής* one who has performed exactly the ceremonies of the cult. But yet the union of the three adjectives in the regulation implies a general state of mind bent singly on the service of the god and the cultus. The *eranistai* doubtless took a very humble view of what constituted a 'pious and good' man; and their use of the adjectives did not agree very closely with the modern use;[4] but there is a certain potentiality and life in the words which might in a suitable situation develop. Because the germ of moral life was faint and weak, we should not, like M. Foucart, deny that it existed at all. Paul, certainly, believed that such a germ existed in their 'ignorant worship,' and aimed at training and strengthening it.

In the Asia Minor inscriptions the precise statements of facts given in some cases show that failure in the duties of life, quite outside of the cultus and ritual of the god, might produce impurity and entail wrath and punishment from the god (see especially the cases quoted in sec. viii.). But in these inscriptions we have to deal with cases occurring after the spread of Christianity in Asia Minor. There can be no doubt that the struggle against Christianity quickened the moral life in the pagan cult; and the moral possibilities that lay in

[1] On this service see sec. vi. p. 57 f., and *C.B.*, pp. 135 ff., 149 ff.

[2] Ce qui leur est commun, c'est que nulle part il n'est question d'autre chose que de la pureté matérielle du corps (*Associations Relig. chez les Grecs*, p. 247).

[3] *Eranoi* were societies formed in Athens and elsewhere for the worship of foreign, chiefly Oriental, deities.

[4] It is a remarkable thing that the adjectives which seem easiest and simplest to the beginner making his first essays in Greek, like *ἀγαθός* and *καλός*, are the most obscure and difficult to the advanced scholar. Who will say how *ἀγαθός* should be rendered in many a passage of Greek, often the most familiar? The one thing we can assert with confidence in many places is that *καλός* does not mean 'beautiful.'

εὐσεβής and ἀγαθός were developed then more than they had been in pre-Christian time.

M. Foucart's statement, therefore, is practically pretty accurate in respect of the period and the country (Greece) which he had chiefly in mind as he wrote;[1] but it needs to be, to some degree, restricted and qualified before it can be used universally. Cases occur where clearly the anger of the god was roused by actual crime and moral guilt. Breaking an oath is distinctly stated to be the cause of impurity in *C.B.*, 41 (ἐπιορκήσας καὶ ἄναγνος), and the refusal to restore money deposited rouses the wrath of the god and entails punishment, which has to be expiated (see sec. viii.). Murder entails lasting impurity in one of Xanthos's inscriptions at Laurium; but this must probably be understood in the sense that a special purificatory ceremony is necessary, and that no mere lapse of time brings purity, as in the case of many other offences. That murder, alike voluntary and accidental, causes impurity, and demands special purificatory rites, was an old belief both in Greece and in Phrygia (as *Herod.* i. 35 shows).

But, even in Asia Minor, the notion involved in ἁγνός was, as a general rule, mere ceremonial and physical purity. Eating the flesh of the sacred animal, the goat, evidently caused impurity (though the place where the word ἄναγνος might be used is lost) (*C.B.*, No. 43; see sec. ii.). An exceedingly gross and disgusting case of personal impurity is mentioned in *C.B.*, No. 50. Xanthos mentions among the rules of his sanctuary that 'all who enter the *hieron* of Men Tyrannos must have bathed the whole body on the same day, and must be pure: impurity from garlic and pork and sexual intercourse lasts a day; from touching a dead body, ten days; from skin disease (φθορά), forty days' (*C.B.*, p. 137). In practice it appears that at Dionysopolis sexual familiarity was the commonest cause.

One of the most striking contrasts in feeling between the votive inscriptions is in reference to the marriage relation. In the votive inscriptions the most frequent cause of impurity arises through the relation of marriage. Apellas was punished, in *C.B.*, No. 46, because he wished to remain with his wife; and it is implied that during the periods when persons were engaged in the divine service (see sec. vi.), they had to separate from their consorts; in other words, 'this religion did not recognize marriage as part of the divine life' (*C.B.*, p. 137). Marriage was a human device, an outrage upon the divine freedom, and the service of the god required a return to the unrestricted sexual licence of primitive man and of the wild animals. Impurity was the result of familiarity with any woman, wife, or other within the forbidden periods, and at no other time; occasionally, as a concession to morality, impurity from another woman lasts twenty-four hours longer than from a wife; but there is not even the most rudimentary conception that familiarity with any other than a wife is wrong at all times. The whole matter is bound within a circle of ceremonial restrictions for special occasions, originating in a form of religion which did not originally recognize marriage.

Again, to appear before the god in a soiled garment was a cause of impurity. Antonia had gone up to the holy place in a soiled garment (ἐν ῥυπαρῷ ἐπενδύτῃ, *C.B.*, No. 52), and was punished by the god, and acknowledged her fault. James (2^2), on the contrary, blames those who pay more attention to the rich man in fine clothing than to the poor worshipper ἐν ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῆτι, and who would give a more honourable place to the more beautiful garment. Undoubtedly Greek ritual would have expressly accepted the rule that the more beautiful garment does more honour to the god. But it is quite in the spirit of the votive inscriptions when the true believers in Sardis are described as those who have not soiled their garments (οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια, Rev 3^4), and who walk in white garments, or when the cleansing of the iniquity of Joshua is symbolized by taking away his filthy garments, and clothing him with a change of raiment (Zec $3^{3.4}$).

Ἁγνός, ἁγνεία, and ἁγνίζω are the most common terms in the inscriptions to indicate purity; but καθαρὸς and καθαρίζω[2] occur occasionally, without any apparent difference being intended between them.

The language of the New Testament seems to make a distinction. It retains the use of ἁγνός and its derivative ἁγνίζω in the sense of ceremonial purity, personal purity, and chastity; while in the sense

[1] His inscriptions mostly are older than Christ, and almost all belong to societies in Greece, chiefly Athens and Rhodes.

[2] Deissmann has observed this (see *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 24), where he points out that καθαρὸς ἀπὸ is not a Hebraism (as is often stated), but is found often in papyri, in an inscription of Pergamos (Fränkel, No. 255), and in Demosthenes; while Xanthos of Laurium used καθαρίζειν ἀπό. Compare Ac 20^{26}.

of moral purity, which is rarely found in the Asia Minor votive inscriptions, it tends to use *καθαρός*, especially with *καρδία*, *συνείδησις*. But James (3^{17} 4^{8}) and Peter (1^{22} 3^{2}) use both *ἁγνός* and *ἁγνίζω* to indicate purity of heart; and so also 1 Jn 3^{3}. Paul's use of *ἁγνός* in Ph 4^{8} and 1 Ti 5^{22} approximates towards this sense; but generally it has in his writings the sense of personal purity and chastity.

VIII. Oath and Perjury.

A remarkable parallel to Mt 5^{34}, 'Swear not at all,' and Ja 5^{12}, 'Swear not,' is found in an inscription of the Katakekaumene. Compare the words, *μὴ ὀμνύετε μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον*, or *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως*, with the warning given on a *stêlê* to beholders, *μὴ ὀμνεῖν τινα μήτε ὁρκίζ[ειν] μήτε ὁρκωμότην γίνεσθαι* (*Smyrn. Mouseion*, No. *φογ'*). The mutilation of the *stêlê* obscures the exact sense, but, probably, the intention was that the oath is likely to be dangerous, as unforeseen circumstances may prevent its fulfilment. The ancient rule—Break not your oaths, but pay them to the Lord, *ἐῤῥέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις· οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, ἀποδώσεις τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου* (Mt 5^{33})—expressed exactly the pagan view; but the oath is a bond from which it often proves hard to get release, and the inscription just quoted advises that none should incur danger by becoming bound by an oath.

An inscription of Philadelphia, a city on the edge of the Katakekaumene (if not actually reckoned in it, certainly possessing part of the Katakekaumene as subject territory), throws light on the advice given against binding oneself by an oath. [Try]phon paid his vow to Mother Anaïtis, when he had discharged the conditions of his oath (*Μητρὶ Ἀναείτιδι γενόμενος ὅρκου μνήμων ἀνέθηκεν εὐχήν*). I can see no explanation of this remarkable inscription, except that *μνήμων* means 'one who has attended to and executed the terms of his oath' (comp. *ἱερομνήμων*). The oath was difficult to discharge; [Try]phon vowed a dedication to the goddess, if he succeeded in freeing himself from the bondage in which the oath placed him; and in this inscription he records that he paid his vow, after the goddess had aided him to discharge his oath.

He who has not kept his oath becomes impure and unfit to engage in the service of the gods. In *C.B.*, No. 41, Sosandros having broken his oath, and being impure (*ἐπιορκήσας καὶ ἄναγνος*), entered the temple of the god and goddess, who are worshipped on the same altar; he was chastised; he gives public warning that none despise the god, since he will have this *stêlê* as an example: *ἐπιορκήσας καὶ ἄναγνος ἰσῆλθα ἰς τὸ σύνβωμον. ἐκολάσθην. παρανγέλλω μηδένα καταφρονεῖν τῶ Λαιρμηνῶ, ἐπεὶ ἔξει τὴν ἐμὴν στήλλην ἔξενπλον.* This is probably the highest moral tone that is observable in any temple inscription in Asia Minor.

C.B., No. 44, was probably similar to No. 41, but breaks off at the word *ὀμόσας*, owing to fracture of the stone.

In 119 A.D., it is narrated in an inscription of the Katakekaumene, how Apollonius gave in trust to Skollos 40 denarii; and when he asked it again, Skollos swore by the gods (whose names were written at the head of the inscription) that he had given it back. Apollonius gave place to the goddess, and left the matter in the hands of the goddess (*παρεχώρησεν*[1] *τῇ θεῷ*). Skollos was punished to the measure of death (*εἰς θανάτου λόγον*); and after his death restitution was demanded by the gods (*ἐπεζητήθη ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν*). His daughter Tatias expiated the oaths which he had taken on himself (*ἔλοισε* (*i.e.* *ἔλυσε*) *τοὺς ὅρκους*); and now having propitiated the gods, she blesses Mother Atimis and Men Tiamou (*εἱλασαμένη εὐλογεῖ Μητρὶ κ.τ.λ.*).

The use of *λύω* here in the sense of 'expiated,' seems to arise through the idea of loosing and untying the bonds by which her father had bound himself, when he swore. From it comes *λύτρον*, which is used once or twice in the sense of an offering of expiation, setting oneself free from guilt by discharge of the duty imposed by the god; *e.g.*, Artemidorus and Amias (his wife) with their six relatives, witting or unwitting,[2] dedicated according to order a *λύτρον* to Men Tyrannos. The sin was some act in which their relatives even unconsciously became involved; and they had all to ransom themselves by paying the penalty.[3] I do not find any instance of *λύω* in this sense in the New Testament; but *λύτρον* occurs in a similar way *δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν* (Mt 20^{28}, Mk 10^{45}).

[1] Probably *τῆς τιμωρίας* is to be understood.

[2] The meaning becomes plain when *ἔξ* is read (as is shown in *Journ. Hell. Stud.*, 1889, p. 227). Dr. Buresch, reading *ἐξ* like the old editors, finds the words unintelligible (*Aus Lydien*, p. 87).

[3] Perhaps *λύθρον* for *λύτρον* occurs in *C.B.*, No. 53.

In this inscription it would almost appear as if the sin of Skollos lay not in appropriating the money entrusted to him, but in coming under oaths to the gods. It is probably implied that his daughter paid the money and thus dissolved the binding force of the oaths; but the stress is laid only on the fact that she expiated the oaths and propitiated the gods.

IX. The Punishment.

The punishment inflicted by the god or the goddess was, as a rule, doubtless, some bodily disease. This is expressly stated in some cases: Ammias was punished in the breasts (ἐκολάσθη εἰς τοὺς μαστούς), because she had spoken sinfully. In *C.B.*, No. 43, general physical debility seems to be the punishment, and in No. 45, a wasting away; but in many cases the representation of some part of the body above the inscription shows that the punishment was an affliction of the organ in question.

The chastisement seems often to have taken the form of fever, in which strength and power waste away without any visible affection of a part of the body. This kind of disease was understood to be caused by fire sent from the world of death by direct act of the god,[1] which consumed the inner life and spirit of the sufferer. Its effect is expressed, 'consumed by fire' (πεπρημένη) in the Cnidian inscriptions, and 'wastes away' τήκω (for τήκομαι), at Dionysopolis (*C.B.*, No. 45).

The punishment sometimes is unto death; τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ in one case, (ε)ἰς θανάτου λόγον in another, and ἐκολάσετο καὶ διέφθειρε ὁ θεός in another case (sec. iv.) may perhaps imply the same issue.[2] Similarly, Paul says in the two passages already quoted (sec. v., vi.), διὰ τοῦτο . . . κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί, and εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός.

The disease from which Paul himself suffered, and which was (as Lightfoot has shown, *Gal.* p. 186 ff.) of a recurring type, may have been fever,[3] and in that case it would naturally be taken by the natives as a visitation of the gods and a reason for contempt and abhorence. Hence it was doubly remarkable that they did not reject him or his message, but treated him as the messenger of God, not the hated of God.

[1] See Wuensch in *Corp. Inscr. Att. Appendix*, p. xii.

[2] In 2 Co 4^{16} διαφθείρεται ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος implies only gradual wasting away (which is indicated by τήκω in *C.B.*, No. 45).

[3] *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 94 ff.

The words of Mt 4^{24}, 'all that were sick, holden with divers diseases and torments,' ποικίλαις νόσοις καὶ βασάνοις, is illustrated by a phrase used in one of the Cnidian inscriptions, imprecating suffering and disease on a woman, 'may it not be her lot to find Demeter propitious, but (may she be) tormented on the rack of great torments,' μεγάλας βασάνους βασανιζομένα. This is a more comprehensive formula than the commoner Cnidian curse 'consumed with the fire' (of fever); and in it, as in Mt, 'torments' is used as a more general term, embracing all 'diseases' and suffering of other kinds in addition. This word βάσανοι, which thus comprehends all sufferings inflicted as a punishment on the living by the gods of the world of death, passes readily into the sense of the torments inflicted on the dead in the future world, Lk $17^{23.28}$.

The children or grandchildren are held responsible for the original wrong or debt due to the god, and are punished for it, as in the old Hebrew belief. Thus, for example, Tatias expiated the oaths on account of which her father had been punished to the measure of death (sec. viii.); and after Theodote died, her grandson had to pay the debt which she had incurred to the god (sec. viii.).

In some inscriptions a man suffers even for the sins of his relations. Thus Aurelios Mousaios, on behalf of his sister, Aphphia (ἀναδεξάμενος τὴν ἀδελφὴν Ἀφφίαν), gave a *stêlê* to the goddess when she demanded it from him. As the demand was addressed to Mousaios, it is probable that his sister had died; and he was made responsible for her debt. And in the case quoted in sec. viii. six relatives, some of whom had not been aware of the fault, are concerned in atoning for it.

A further proof of the importance which was attached by ancient belief to fevers as being caused by the direct action of the gods of the world of death, and as an evidence of the power and wrath of those gods, occurs in the Sethianic curses, written on leaden tablets, which were found in 1850 in a tomb on the Appian Way close to Rome, and have just been published by Dr. Wünsch.[4] In the first the curse is *patiatur febr(e)s, frigus, tortion(e)s, pallor(e)s, sudores, obripilation(e)s meridianas interdianas serutinas nocturnas.* This is merely a description of fever with its recurring paroxysms and the characteristic symptoms. *Tortiones* corresponds to the Greek βάσανοι.

[4] *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln*, 1898.

The Sethianic tablets belong to the fourth century; but the formulæ and the curses are evidently hereditary and of long standing. Thus No. 3 ends *ut omnes cognoscant exemplum eorum*; which is exactly in the style of the Dionysopolitan *exemplaria*.

X. The Demand for Payment.

In many cases, where some debt has been incurred to the god, the latter seeks for payment; it is probable that this demand made by the god was very similar to the order (ἐπιταγὴ) which he issued in other cases (sec. xiii.). He makes it known (whether by dream or through the officials of the temple, there is no evidence in any case to show) that a debt has been incurred, and requires the debtor to pay. In many instances it would appear that the demand was only for public confession and acknowledgment on a *stêlê* (στήλην ἀπαιτηθεὶς ἀπέδωκα). In some cases a man who had made a prayer and vow (sec. ii.) did not recognize that his prayer had been granted and the payment earned by the god. In that case the god demanded payment. The commonest term is ἐπιζητέω, but ἀπαιτεῖν is sometimes used: the idea is that of the Latin legal term, *repeto*.

Ἐπιζητεῖν is common, and ἀπαιτεῖν occurs, in the New Testament in the same general sense as in the inscriptions, *e.g.* γενεὰ πονηρὰ σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ (Mt 16^4), τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει (Lk 6^{30}), τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ (Lk 12^{20}). But there seems to be no case where the demand is made by God.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

Genesis iii. 15.

'And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.'

Exposition.

'I will put enmity between thee and the woman.'—This verse adds yet another punishment [upon the serpent]. Not only is it to be an outcast creature, but also one hated with a deadly hatred. Irreconcilable enmity, a life and death struggle, is to be and continue between man and it. Since it is a penal sentence against the serpent, the principal emphasis must be laid upon man's hostile treatment of the serpent, whereas its hostility to man is introduced only as the reverse side, and as known from the relations that actually exist. But the enmity is not to be merely between her who first fell and the first seducer, but is to continue between their respective descendants, from generation to generation.

It is well known that such a deadly enmity does now actually prevail against the (animal) serpent. The worship of serpents among many peoples, as unnatural, and a sort of monstrosity, does not militate against this statement. If in any way, it is evident from this that the serpent, as representative of the evil power, is cursed. Evil thoughts, a serpent brood, ever and again steal up in enmity to the sons of men, in order to poison for them their innermost life; but by divine decree there is appointed against them unresting strife on the part of man.—Dillmann.

The open enmity between man and serpent recurs in the whole Orient; it is everywhere impressed with a religious character; it bears a hidden symbolical meaning; it is the combat either against the tempter, or against the prince of evil. The propriety of selecting just that reptile for such purpose has been made more manifest by the scientific study of zoology. It is argued that the organism of the serpents is one of extreme degradation; their bodies are lengthened out by the mere vegetative repetitions of the vertebræ; like the worms, they advance only by the ring-like scutes of the abdomen, without fore or hinder limbs; though they belong to the latest creatures of the animal kingdom, they represent a decided retrogression in the scale of beings (comp. Hugh Miller, *Test. of the Rocks*, pp. 82–85).—Kalisch.

'It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.'—The only meaning which can be philologically defended is '*crush*.' This meaning suits Job 9^{17} but not Ps 139^{11}. The alternative rendering is '*lie in wait for*,' which suits Ps 139^{11} better than '*crush*,' but a word = '*cover*' is required there.

Dillmann admits that the meaning '*crush*' suits the first part of the clause, *i.e.* the man's crushing the serpent's head, but denies its application to the serpent, and adopts the rendering '*lie in wait for*'; but this meaning is not so certain as the meaning '*crush*,' and the double accusative after the rendering '*lie in wait for*' is difficult.—Spurrell.

The sense of the whole verse is accordingly this: Instead of the friendly relationship between the woman and the serpent, which for the woman had been so unfortunate, an irreconcilable conflict is to be kindled between men and the accursed beast. In it the animal will, indeed, in its insidious fashion, continually seek to be a match for them; but they are openly and manfully to deliver the deathblow against it. That the struggle will prove in the end the destruction of the serpent (of the evil power) is not expressly stated, but

follows already from the fact that the curse of God lies upon the beast, and still more from the intention of God with regard to man, as that has appeared in his creation and previous guidance. A struggle ordained of God cannot be without prospect of success. The whole subsequent history is to bear the character of a struggle of mankind against the temptation to sin. In what manner man will carry the day does not yet need to be declared.—DILLMANN.

Since '*bruise*' may just as well be understood individually as collectively, and it is not said that it shall be given to the man to beget, but to the woman to bring forth, that which shall bruise the serpent's head, the prophecy is designed by its form also to concur with its fulfilment. For it was necessary that Christ, to avoid first conquering in Himself the seed of the serpent, should be '*born of woman*' in a miraculously exclusive manner, a heavenly gift of grace deposited in the womb of a woman. This first prophecy of redemption is not only the most general and most indefinite; it is also, when regarded in the light of its fulfilment, the most comprehensive and the most profound. 'General, indefinite, obscure as the primeval age to which it belongs,' says Drechsler, 'it lies marvellously and sacredly on the threshold of the lost Paradise like an awe-inspiring sphinx before the ruins of a mysterious temple'; and the Son of the Virgin was the first—we add—to solve by fulfilling it the enigma of this sphinx, which had been too difficult for all the saints and prophets.—DELITZSCH.

METHOD OF TREATMENT.

The Great Conflict.

This is the statement of a mighty conflict. And these three things have to be considered about it. How it began; How it was carried on; and How it came to an end.

I. *How this great Conflict began.*—Let us go back a little. So far as it has been revealed to us, God has made three, and only three, different orders of creatures. The first we call Angels; the second Men; and the third include the lower animals and all other created things. He created them all for obedience. But with a difference. The third order—the lower animals and all other lower things whether living or dead—He created for obedience pure and simple; but angels and men He created for obedience through love. The beasts obey because they have no choice. The sun rises and sets with unvarying regularity, and we use it to point the moral of punctual obedience.

> It never comes an hour too soon,
> Nor brings too long a day.

But it has no credit for that. It simply cannot help it. It was made to obey, and it has no choice but unwavering obedience. Angels and men were made for obedience also, but not for mechanical obedience. They were made to obey through love. The sun was made to do God's bidding; angels and men were made to love the Lord with all their heart. Now love implies choice. There must be freedom. I cannot love if I cannot do else but love. I cannot love unless I am also free to hate. There must be freedom of choice.

So angels and men were left free to choose good or evil, and it is recorded that some angels and all men chose evil. The fall of the angels is not fully related in Scripture, since it does not concern us to know its circumstances. We do not even know for certain what was the cause of it. Shakespeare makes Wolsey say:

> Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition,
> By that sin fell the angels.

And we have accepted that view of it. But whatever was the cause, we know that some of the angels chose the evil and fell.

Man chose the evil and fell also. The story of that Choice and Fall is told in this third chapter of Genesis. And the point to notice first about it is that it was brought about through the temptation of one of the fallen angels. The narrative in Genesis speaks of the serpent. And throughout the narrative the language is accommodated to the beast. But he would be a dull interpreter who saw no more in this story than an old serpent myth. We interpret Scripture by itself. And it is certain that in later Scripture it is freely recognized that the author of Eve's temptation was Satan, the first of the fallen angels.

What does that mean? It means that when an angel falls, he falls more utterly than man. No one tempted the angels to their fall. They deliberately chose the evil of themselves. And so their fall was into evil—evil absolute. Henceforth the fallen angels are only evil in will and in purpose. And their work is to do evil continually. So the prince of the fallen angels comes, and out of the evil that is in him, tempts man to his ruin.

Thus both angels and men have fallen, but the difference in their fall is very great. First, men have not fallen into evil absolutely as the angels. Their moral darkness is still pierced with some rays of light. And, secondly, men may be redeemed from their evil, the fallen angels may not.

For there is an organic unity among men. There is a human nature. And when men fall

they fall together—it is *man* that falls, not men. There is no angel nature. 'They neither marry nor are given in marriage.' Each of the fallen angels fell by himself alone. Deliberately he chose the evil for himself. So, when he fell, he fell never to rise again. Robert Burns may say:

> Auld Nicky Ben,
> Oh, wad ye tak' a thocht an' men',
> Ye aiblins micht, I dinna ken,
> Still hae a stake.

But it is a purely human sentiment. There is no warrant for such expectation or possibility in Scripture. The warrant is very plainly all the other way.

But man falls that he may rise again. For there is a solidarity in man. One touch of nature makes the whole world kin. And if only One will come and take this human nature on Him, enter this flesh of sin and condemn sin in the flesh, then will the way be open to man to return to the love and obedience of his God. And He will come.

Thus, then, the Great Conflict began. Tempted by Satan, man fell, but not utterly nor irrecoverably. He will henceforth keep up a continuous warfare with Satan. There will be enmity between Adam and Satan, and between their seed from generation to generation, till One shall come to win the victory for man.

II. *How this great Conflict was carried on.*—Eve thought it was to be a short conflict. When her first-born came she said, 'I have gotten a man from the Lord.' But Cain grew up to manhood and Abel his brother; 'and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.' The hoped-for Victor is man's earliest murderer. Then Lamech thought he had found the Deliverer. 'This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our own hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed.' And he called his son's name Noah. For now in the conflict Satan has so steadily won that it is needful to sweep man from off the face of the earth, and make, as it were, a new start. But Noah cannot save his brethren. He barely escapes with his own family. And the flood is only past when even Noah himself has fallen under the lash of the Tempter.

Men have got a new start, however. Will they cope with Satan now? Not so. Steadily again Satan wins. And the earth grows so corrupt that God chooses one man and takes him out of the surrounding abomination, to keep him apart and train him and his family for Himself and His great purpose. That man is Abraham.

Not that God now leaves the rest of the human race to the unresisted will of Satan. In no place, and at no time, has God left Himself without witnesses. Or, as the other evangelist more personally puts it, He kept coming amongst men in the Person of the Word, and whenever anyone was found willing to follow the Light, power was given to him to become a child of God. This choice of Abraham and his family is a new departure, that through him and his seed all the families of the earth may be blessed.

Is this new departure successful? Does the family of Abraham now gain the victory over Satan, and gain it always? No; not even for themselves; still less for the rest of mankind. As the same evangelist has it, 'He came unto *His own*, and His own received Him not.' But God's purpose is not in vain, nor even thwarted for a moment. Man *will* be redeemed, and the redemption is delayed only that it may be to love and new obedience, the will to choose being still left free.

And now we can trace the gradual closing of the promise on a single Person. 'A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you.' 'Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.' 'The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple.' 'Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.'

Meanwhile, the world is getting more and more utterly bruised by the bite of the serpent. Read that terrible yet true description of the morals of men which St. Paul gives us in his Epistle to the Romans. Read also the scathing exposure in the Gospels of the irreligiousness of the religion of Israel, the hypocrisy and greed of the leaders and rulers of the people. Satan thinks he has gained the victory along the whole line.

III. *How the Conflict came to an end.*—Jesus had two battles to fight. First, He had to meet Satan, and gain His own personal victory over him. And so, immediately after the baptism, in which He was consecrated to His work, He is driven by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by Satan. He gained that victory.

Next, He has to gain the victory for man, for the whole human race. That was a harder battle to fight, more prolonged, more fiercely

bitter. But He gained that victory also. And how did He gain it? Just in the opposite way in which man lost it. Man lost his battle, both in the Garden of Eden and ever afterwards, by preferring his own will to the will of God. Jesus won His battle by an absolute surrender of His will. It was a harder battle than man could ever have had. 'Father, if it be possible,' He was constrained to cry. But immediately He added, 'Yet not My will, but Thine be done.' Man lost his battle always by selfishly saving his life. Jesus won His battle for Himself and for us by losing His life.

Illustrations.

The merely literal explanation of the verse clearly does not exhaust its meaning. There is something more in the words than a declaration that the human race will always view with feelings of instinctive aversion the serpent race. There is something more in the words than a prediction that mankind will be able to assert superiority over this reptile foe among the beasts of the field. We need not doubt that, whichever of the alternative renderings of the verb be preferred, the underlying thought is that of a spiritual conflict between the race of man and the influences of temptation, between humanity with its gift of choice and the Principle of Evil which ever suggests the satisfaction of the lower desires. But, in addition to this main thought, a twofold encouragement is given to nerve him for the fray. He is endowed with capacities enabling him, if he will use them, to inflict a deadly blow upon the adversary. He stands erect, he is made in the image of God. Furthermore, the promise of ultimate victory is assured to him.—H. E. Ryle.

Traditions of the Fall are to be found in every religion of the world. 'Yeina, the first man in Aryan tradition, passed his life in a state of bliss, till he committed the sin which weighs on his descendants, and for this he was driven out of Paradise, after being a thousand years in it, and was given up to the Serpent, who finally brought about his death by horrible torment. . . . Even the prediction of the crushing of the head of the serpent has perpetuated itself in the traditions of mankind. In the oldest Hindoo temples two figures of Krishna are still seen, in one of which he is trampling on the crushed head of the serpent, while in the other the serpent clings round him, and bites his heel.'—Geikie.

Near the manchaneel, which grows in the forests of the West Indies, and which gives forth a juice of deadly poisonous nature, grows a fig, the sap of which, if applied in time, is a remedy for the diseases produced by the manchaneel. God places the gospel of grace alongside the sentence of death.—W. Adamson.

We grow all out of patience with men's crude and sweeping and unqualified epitomes of life. One man says, 'It is all good,' and will see none of the evil and sin and misery which are everywhere. Another man says, 'It is all bad'; and for him all the brightness and graciousness and perpetual progress go for nothing. One man calls humanity a hopeless brute. Another man calls humanity a triumphant angel. God in these words of Genesis says, 'Neither! but a wounded, bruised, strong creature, not running and leaping and shouting, often crawling and creeping in its pain, but yet brave, with an inextinguishable certainty of ultimate success, fighting a battle which is full of pain but is not desperate, sure ultimately to set his heel on his adversary's head.'—Phillips Brooks.

Boast not against us, O our enemy!
To-day we fall, but we shall rise again;
We grope to-day, to-morrow we shall see:
What is to-day that we should fear to-day?
A morrow cometh which shall sweep away
Thee and thy realm of change and death and pain.
C. Rossetti.

Sermons for Reference.

Arnold (T.), Sermons, vi. 9.
Arnot (W.), Anchor of the Soul, 68.
Baron (D.), Rays of Messiah's Glory, 255.
Belfrage (H.), Sacramental Addresses, 1.
Brooks (P.), Twenty Sermons, 93.
Caughey (J.), Revival Sermons, 266.
Cumming (J.), Church before the Flood, 133, 156.
Farrar (F.), Eternal Hope, 220.
Gibson (J. M.), Ages before Moses, 98.
Glover (R.), By the Waters of Babylon, 218.
How (W. W.), Plain Words, ii. 64.
Leathes (S.), Truth and Life, 14.
Pressensé (E. de), The Redeemer, 1.
Robinson (S.), Discourses of Redemption, 57.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Everlasting Gospel, 13, 25.
,, ,, The Messiah, 67.
,, ,, Sermons, vol. xxii. No. 1326.
Steere (E.), Notes of Sermons, No. 24.
Thorne (H.), Foreshadowings of the Gospel, 11.
Vaughan (C. J.), Christ the Light of the World, 112.
,, ,, Family Prayer and Sermon Book, i. 148.
,, (J.), Sermons, ix. 53.
Winterbotham (R.), Sermons and Expositions, 8.

Recent Foreign Theology.

New Cuneiform Inscriptions.

In a sumptuously printed volume (*Mission en Cappadoce 1893–1894*, Paris, Leroux, 1898) M. Ernest Chantre has just published the results of his excavations at Boghaz Keui, Euyuk, and other Hittite sites in Asia Minor. The excavations were undertaken at the expense of M. Guimet, and the objects found in them are now in the Musée Guimet at Paris. They have been reproduced, many of them in colours, in M. Chantre's work, and throw a new and welcome light on many of the problems of Oriental archæology. Among them are vases and fragments of pottery which help to bridge over the gulf between the ceramic art of Asia and prehistoric Greece, terra-cotta heads of animals which are characteristic of Cappadocian or Asianic religion and art, and numerous bronze figures which we may provisionally term Hittite. Nor must we forget the clay spindle-whorls which are identical in form and ornamentation with those found by Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik.

But the most important of M. Chantre's discoveries are the inscriptions. Very little indeed was found in the way of Hittite texts, and that little consisted of clay impressions of seals disinterred at Boghaz Keui; but several fresh Cappadocian inscriptions were met with as well as cuneiform tablets. The Cappadocian inscriptions, the first of which was brought to light many years ago by Hamilton, turn out to be not only in the Phrygian alphabet, but also in the Phrygian language, or at all events in a dialect closely allied to it, and belong to the period after the fall of the Assyrian empire, when the Phrygians spread over Cappadocia and Armenia, and an Aryan language superseded that of the cuneiform inscriptions of Van. The chapter on the Cappadocian texts has been contributed by the competent pen of M. de Saussure.

It is, however, the cuneiform tablets which possess the greatest interest and are of the highest scientific importance. Some of these are in what is now known as the Cappadocian script and dialect, and come from the temple archives of an Assyrian colony settled near Kaisariyeh in the district called Khani-rabbat or the Greater Khani by the Babylonians. The language of them is a modified Assyrian, and a study of the proper names contained in them has induced me to give up my old opinion that they are of the age of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, and rally to the view of Professor Jensen, who would refer them to the period of Khammurabi. The Cappadocian tablets with which we have hitherto been acquainted are derived from a mound near Kaisariyeh called Gyül Tepé, and most of those purchased by M. Chantre from the peasants of the neighbourhood must have come from the same site. But he also obtained two from the mound of Kara Euyuk, north-east of Kaisariyeh, where he made extensive excavations and found a large quantity of Cappadocian or Hittite objects. At first I thought it possible that Gyül Tepé and Kara Euyuk might prove to be the same place, more especially as both represent the sites of burnt cities; but an examination of the contents of the tablets seems to indicate the contrary. While the proper names in the Gyül Tepé tablets are predominantly Assyrian in type, most of those in the Kara Euyuk tablets are Asianic and not Semitic at all.

The Cappadocian tablets were purchased by M. Chantre. But at Boghaz Keui he himself discovered others, all of them unfortunately in a fragmentary condition, but nevertheless of the highest archæological value. The language of them is unknown, or rather a comparison of it with that of the two letters from Arzawa included in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence shows it to be the same as that of Arzawa, which can be partially deciphered, thanks to the ideographs with which the longer and more perfect of the two letters is filled. When in 1889 I published for the first time the text of the latter letter, I suggested that it might turn out to be written in the Hittite language, and the suggestion is now verified. Boghaz Keui was a great Hittite centre, and the Hittite inscriptions which have been found there show that the Hittite hieroglyphs were employed on the spot down to a comparatively late time. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that in the language of the cuneiform tablets of Boghaz Keui we have that of the still undeciphered Hittite texts.

And in fact I have detected in the fragments discovered by M. Chantre not only the proper name Khattu-sipa, which is parallel to the Hittite name Khattu-sar, and perhaps also Sapa-lulme, but the adjective *Kha-ta-a-na* as well. In one of the Arzawa letters it has long been recognised that the words *Khattanas* SARR-*us* must signify 'Hittite King.'

We have already learnt from the Arzawa letters what was the structure of the language they contain, as well as several of the grammatical suffixes, and the forms of the possessive pronouns. What we have now to do is to identify the suffixes, the pronunciation of which is given us in the cuneiform texts, with the corresponding hieroglyphs which express them in the Hittite inscriptions. In this way we shall ascertain the phonetic values of a certain number of the Hittite characters, and a basis will at last be afforded for the decipherment of the Hittite texts. A beginning has already been made. Many years ago I identified one of the Hittite signs—that representing a yoke—with the nominative suffix *(e)s*, and this identification is regarded by Messerschmidt in his recent criticism of Jensen (*Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Inschriften*) as one of the very few facts of Hittite decipherment which may be considered certain. Since then I have suggested that the suffix denoted by the gloved hand was that of the accusative which in the Arzawa letters had the sound of *-n*; if I am right, the phonetic value of another character will have been ascertained. At all events the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions has at last been brought within measurable distance.

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

The Science of Religion.

WE have received three lectures, with titles as below,[1] delivered at the first Congress of those interested in the Science of Religion, held at Stockholm in September of last year.

Sabatier's lecture contains opinions which are already familiar to readers of his brilliant, and not too profound, 'Philosophy of Religion.' He addresses himself to the problem of reconciling the modern spirit with religious faith, which is so often regarded by liberal thinkers as the greatest obstacle yet remaining to the advent of a better future. Must we choose, he asks, between the destruction of faith and the triumph of superstition? To settle this question, Sabatier analyzes the principles which lie at the foundation both of modern culture and of traditional religion. A specially interesting section of the lecture deals with the frigid relations between religion and culture which exist within the pale of Romanism. The author is at his best, perhaps, in describing the more genial reception accorded by Protestantism to modern science, art, literature, and politics. Finally, Sabatier reduces the alleged opposition between religion and science to the natural difference which cannot but exist between the mystical and theoretical sides of experience. If, again, it be asked, what faith has to do with conduct, he replies, in a fine sentence, that 'piety is the soul of morality.' By various examples he illustrates the reciprocal interpenetration which goes on continually between culture and religion, and contends that culture, by its ceaseless criticism, has forced religion to purify its idea of God, to humanize its conception of the Person of Christ, and to transform and spiritualize its theory of the Church.

Anything which Sabatier writes is sure to be readable. Epigrams which it is difficult to forget sparkle on every page. The theology of this pamphlet might be termed 'diluted Ritschlianism.' It may be enough to sustain the individual, but one cannot but ask whether it is sufficient to justify the existence of a Church.

Martensen Larsen takes as his subject 'The Place of Jesus in the History of Religion.' There are scholars in this department who reduce Him to the same level as the heroes of pagan myths; some investigators, indeed, do not hesitate to affirm an historical connection between Christ and Buddhism, and have found in the fables of Eastern religions parallels to the miraculous narratives of the Gospels. What is the true science of the matter?

Larsen replies that the history of religion, *as a science*, finds something absolutely unique in Jesus Christ, and that something is His consciousness of being the Son of God. This consciousness is

[1] 'Die Religion und die moderne Kultur,' von Prof. August Sabatier. M.0.80. 'Jesus und die Religionsgeschichte,' von lic. th. H. Martensen Larsen. M.0.60. 'Die Religion und die soziale Entwicklung,' von Nathan Söderblom. M.1.60. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr.

not the result of reasoning; it is intuitive. The attempt to explain it by the theology of His time utterly fails. Anything of the kind to be found in the Old Testament, or in the religious literature of other peoples and times is only the expression of a *tendency* which finds its perfect fulfilment in Christ. The history of religion says: No one has ever felt himself God's Son as Jesus did; faith adds: The reason is that no one ever *was* God's Son as Jesus was. And faith is right.

The writer keeps rigidly to his task, which is to give a scientific, rather than a believing, answer to the question with which he starts. One can only admire his sobriety of statement, applaud the lucidity of his thought, and concur in his conclusions.

In Söderblom's short treatise, for its length is too great for a lecture, we have a wise, careful, and thoroughly competent discussion of the duty of the Church towards the social revolution which is slowly proceeding at the present day. While maintaining decisively the supernatural character of religion, he contends that religious men ought to adopt a more positive and helpful attitude towards the working classes than is commonly the case. To preach contentment is not the Church's only task. Doubtless the regeneration of the individual is the true solution of the social question, but there still remains an infinite deal to be done by the Christian congregation, as a brotherhood whose task it is to pervade every secular relationship with the spirit of Divine justice and compassion. The material aim of religion is to provide for all an existence worthy of their manhood.

The author has at his command a vast amount of historical information with which to illustrate his position, though it would gain in impressiveness if it were better arranged. The whole is written in a spirit of candour and earnestness which inspire sympathetic confidence in the reader.

HUGH R. MACKINTOSH.

Tayport.

Among the Periodicals.

A Roman Catholic View of the New 'Dictionary of the Bible.'

IT is with unusual interest that we turn to the notice of the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE in the pages of the *Revue Biblique Internationale* (October 1898). This publication deservedly enjoys the highest reputation for scholarship, and, while an organ of the Roman Catholic Church, it is scrupulously fair, nay, even generous, in its notice of work done outside the pale of that Church. In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June last (pp. 405 f.) we gave an account of a remarkable article, contributed by Père Lagrange to the *Revue Biblique*, on 'Les Sources du Pentateuque,' which will have prepared our readers for the very significant attitude assumed towards the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.

The notice opens with an appreciative reference to the magnitude of the work, and the assurances from all quarters that if it continues to maintain the level at which it has begun, this Dictionary will be the best Biblical Encyclopædia, one in which the results of scientific research are popularized in a way to make the work of extreme value to every one who can make a prudent use of it. Naturally, the reviewer makes some reservations, especially where we should expect a Roman Catholic writer to do so, namely, in the department of Biblical Theology, a department where, as we are reminded, the *Guardian* made similar reservations. The latter suggested that, while in theory there might be nothing to prevent a Nonconformist, say, from doing justice to a doctrine accepted by the Church of England, still it would have been safer to entrust the articles which treat of doctrines characteristic of each Christian communion to writers belonging to that communion. The *Revue Biblique* is quite justified in pushing this principle a step farther, if it is to be acted upon, and pointing out to the *Guardian* that when a word is differently interpreted by the Catholic Church and by Anglicans, it would be safer to entrust the article dealing with it to an exegete or a theologian of the Catholic Church.

The reviewer joins in the almost universal approval that has been meted out to the critical part of the Dictionary, where in so many instances specialists, who have dealt with their subject elsewhere on a larger scale, have presented the result of their studies in an accessible form. 'Among the articles devoted to the Literature of the New Testament may be cited as models of clearness, of scientific precision, and of popularization, *Chronology of N. T.* (Turner), *Acts of*

the Apostles (Headlam), *Epistles to the Corinthians* (Robertson), *Ephesians* (Lock), *Colossians* (Murray); while the articles on the *Arabic*, *Egyptian*, *Armenian*, *Ethiopic Versions* (by Burkitt, F. Robinson, Conybeare, and Charles respectively) place at the disposition of the public the result of labours confined hitherto to very technical publications. The extra-canonical literature, Jewish or Jewish-Christian Apocalypses, apocryphal acts of prophets or apostles will be treated by Mr. Charles, who has already contributed the article *Enoch*, and Dr. James; the readers of the *Revue Biblique* know the unimpeachable authority of these two scholars in their own sphere, which has such peculiar attractions.'

As to the Old Testament, the reviewer notes that this is treated entirely from the critical point of view—a symptom of the change that has taken place in England within the last twenty years. At the same time the field is left open for discussion on many points, and the list of authors, which includes Professors Sayce and Hommel, who are often supposed to be opposed out and out to the 'higher criticism,' is a guarantee of fairness. The reviewer quotes, with approval, a sentence from the *Guardian*, to the effect that the labours of critics have by no means shattered the basis of Christian faith, but have served to make us know better the mode of the Divine inspiration in the Old Testament. He sees no ground for alarm, but the reverse, in the circumstance that, through works like the new Dictionary, the 'higher criticism,' instead of being confined to the speculations of theologians, is now brought within the reach of all who may be interested in those questions.

The Text of the Old Testament.

Professor Rothstein of Halle, the translator into German of Driver's *Introduction*, contributes an important article, entitled 'Text, Canon, und Uebersetzungen des Alten Testaments,' to the October number of the *Theol. Rundschau*. Somewhat in the style of Macaulay's *Essays*, he uses a number of recent works on the Old Testament as the text for a general dissertation on the proper methods and the present position of Textual Criticism.

He sets out with calling attention to the notorious fact that the text of many of the Old Testament books does not lie before us in the form in which it came from the pen of the original writers. Hence a careful, critical examination of the text is the necessary preliminary to all further critical operations. Now there are two ways of going to work. Where there appears to be manifest corruption of the text, a good deal may be accomplished by conjectural emendation based upon the known causes of scribal errors, and upon other probabilities. This, in view of the extremely meagre aid to be derived from Hebrew MSS., is, of course, called for in dealing with the Old Testament to an extent which happily does not arise in the New Testament. But, in the second place, we possess in the ancient versions an aid which we must appreciate all the more highly because of the comparative uselessness of the MSS. referred to. Unfortunately, here we are hampered again by the circumstance that the text of these versions is itself frequently so uncertain, not to speak of the uncertainty that must prevail as to whether the version in any particular case offers a true, if somewhat free, reproduction of the Hebrew original, or whether the translator introduced changes for dogmatic reasons, or failed at times to understand the text that lay before him. Rothstein thinks it may be a long time yet before all the conditions are established that will make a thoroughly reliable text of the Old Testament possible. Meanwhile all work is to be welcomed that brings this goal nearer. Much valuable material has been accumulated already in commentaries and other writings dealing with books of the Old Testament, and he emphasizes the fact that the majority of modern authors display in their criticism of the text sound philological caution, even in using the testimony of the versions. Extremely valuable contributions towards the solution of the above problems he notes as having been frequently made in Stade's *ZATW*. As the most notable instance of an edition of a book of the Bible provided with a complete and all-round *Apparatus Criticus* based upon sound philological methods, he selects Cornill's *Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig, 1886).

Rothstein passes on to speak of the series that is being issued under the name of the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, edited by P. Haupt. With the aim and the methods of this great work he has much sympathy, but notes, what has been already perceived by not a few, the necessarily unequal character of the different parts. A great

deal must always depend upon the value which different scholars entrusted with different parts of the work attach respectively to the Massoretic text or to the Alexandrian and other versions. A similar subjective element will reveal itself also in regard to the distinction of the 'sources' in cases where relative unanimity has not yet been reached. These defects Rothstein finds attaching to Ball's *Genesis*, a work possessed of many excellences, but too 'subjective' both in regard to its critical handling of the text and its treatment of the 'sources.' Quite a different verdict is pronounced upon Kamphausen's *Daniel* in the same series. Kamphausen maintains an attitude of discriminating conservatism towards the Massoretic text, and when an emendation of the latter is manifestly indispensable, he carries out the task in a fashion so free from all subjectivity or arbitrariness, that the reader feels he is in the hands of a trustworthy guide. Perhaps, and here Rothstein echoes the opinion of many, a little more emendation of the text would not have been out of place, but it may be better to err in this direction than in that followed in Ball's *Genesis*.

As is well known, in the Greek Bible the translation of Theodotion in the Book of Daniel early displaced that of the LXX. The latter version was long lost, till last century it was rediscovered in the library of Cardinal Chigi at Rome. This (the Codex Chisianus) found a valuable auxiliary in the discovery at Milan of the Syriac translation of the Hexaplar LXX text. Now, the LXX text raises questions at once of much interest and of much difficulty. On the one hand, we have the remarkable circumstance that the translation of chs. 1, 2, 3 shows itself throughout to be a real (if marked by many peculiarities) reproduction of the text that lies before us, and that in like manner the translation of chs. 7–12 is a literal (not unfrequently literal to the verge of unintelligibility) rendering of the present text, while the Greek of chs. 4–6 treats the Semitic text with an almost incredible degree of freedom. On the other hand, the so-called Additions to the Book of Daniel, as these appear in the LXX as compared with their form in Theodotion, raise another interesting problem in the literary history. The insertions in ch. 3 (the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children) are essentially the same in both Versions; but the other pieces (Susanna, Bel and the Dragon) show such differences as to make it impossible to regard the form they bear in Theodotion as simply worked over from the LXX. Professor Bludau of Münster, in his *Die Alex. Uebersetzung d. Buches Daniel u. ihr Verhältniss z. Massor. Text*, arrives at the following conclusions regarding the questions just stated:—The LXX translator of chs. 1–3 and 7–12 meant to produce a Greek translation to take the place of the original, and in spite of many uncertainties, this translation may be taken as supplying for these chapters a relatively trustworthy testimony as to the text of Daniel which was read in Alexandria in the 2nd cent. B.C. Bludau concludes regarding chs. 4–6 that their Greek text 'ought to be called an editing rather than a translation.' As to the Additions or deutero-canonical portions, he holds that for all these a Semitic original is at least highly probable. Rothstein thinks this conclusion certain as far as the insertions in ch. 3 are concerned, but is not so clear as to the rest. Regarding the peculiar relation of the LXX text of Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon, to the text of Theodotion, Bludau holds, Rothstein thinks rightly, that the difference between the two is explicable only upon the assumption that the (Semitic) originals underlying them also deviated from one another. Finally, Bludau seeks to explain the remarkable phenomena presented by the relation of the LXX text to the M.T., and, in the case of the Additions, to Theodotion's version. He regards it as probable that the translator had already before him a Greek version of chs. 4–6 and 13, 14, and that he took this up into his own work. This comes practically to the view supported by Bevan and Kamphausen that the LXX version of Daniel is the work of two different hands.

The Date of the Capture of Babylon by Cyrus, etc.

In the current number (1898, Heft II.) of the *ZATW*, Ed. Meyer writes in defence of certain positions adopted by him in his *Entstehung des Judenthums*, which have been called in question.

The first of these concerns the date of Cyrus' capture of Babylon. Kittel (in *ZATW*, xviii. p. 152) gives this date as 16 Tammuz (June–July), 539, and remarks, 'Ed. Meyer (*Entsteh. d. Judenth.* p. 47) wrongly gives the date as 16 Tisri (= 12 October).' Meyer admits that to appearance Kittel is right, all editors and translators of the

Chronicle of Nabonidos dating the Fall of Babylon on 16 Tammuz. But he argues that there must be a mistake in this. From the 17th year of Nabonidos (539/8) we have a continuous series of documents coming down to the 28th day of the 6th month; then come three isolated dates, x/7, x/8, x/9. The most of these texts, including the last three, proceed from Sippara. The last document expressly marked as from Babylon is dated vii/4, besides which we have a text dated xxi/5 and two v/6, proceeding from a locality named apparently only by Nabonidos, 'the house of the king of Babel,' by which perhaps the residency, and thus presumably a part of Babylon, may be understood. On the other hand, the series of texts dated after Cyrus begins with x/7 of the year of his entry, then follow the dates xxiv/8, vii/9, xxiv/9, etc., all from Sippara. The first document from Babylon is dated xxi/12 of the year of his entry. All this would suit admirably with the texts of Nabonidos but for the two of those dated from the 8th and 9th months. These two dates Meyer can explain only as due to a slip on the part of the author or the editor of the tablet. On the other hand, it is clear that Sippara and Babylon cannot have fallen in Tammuz, but, at the earliest, two months later, in Tisri. This is supported by the fact that, according to the Chronicle of Nabonidos, it was not till the 3rd of Marcheshwan (the 8th month) that Cyrus made his entry into Babylon. But the Chronicle of Nabonidos itself proves that Babylon was not taken on the 16th Tammuz. For two lines earlier we find ourselves in Elul, the 6th month. 'Till the end of Elul the gods of the land of Akkad were transported to Babylon.' This is impossible if already a month and a half before, in the middle of Tammuz, the dominion of Nabonidos was at an end. Hence it is clear that the sign for Tammuz has been wrongly written for the quite similar one for Tisri (the 7th month), or, perhaps more likely, that the latter really stood in the text and that the distinguishing stroke has disappeared. If we substitute Tisri for Tammuz, everything falls into place. Nabonidos seeks for help from the gods of the country; up to the end of Elul (Sept. 539) their images are carried to the capital. But immediately thereafter Cyrus triumphs; on 14th Tisri (8th Oct.) Sippara, and on the 16th of the same month Babylon, is occupied, and Nabonidos taken prisoner. Then on the 3rd Marcheshwan (27th Oct.) Cyrus entered Babylon in triumph and accorded grace to the city. During the next months, Kislev to Adar (December–March), the gods of Akkad were sent back to their homes. Thus, while, according to the old reading, an inexplicable interval of three and a half months elapsed between Cyrus' capture of Babylon and his entrance into the city, the interval, upon Meyer's interpretation, is reduced to a little over fourteen days.

The reader will do well to turn to the *ZATW* to see how Meyer deals also with Löhr's criticisms of his treatment of Ezr 4–6 and of the names Shesbazzar and Senazar.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Kautzsch's 'Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.'[1]

It is with the utmost pleasure that we herald the appearance of the first number of this most important and most necessary work. Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* has received a very cordial welcome from all competent judges, and the same reception will no doubt be accorded to this new publication which was needed to complete that great work. In form and typographical arrangements the former principles are carried out, two slight changes, both of which are claimed as improvements, being noted—the footnote references being indicated, not by asterisks, etc., but by small Roman figures (a, b, c, etc.), and the critical discussions being given at the foot of the page (this is *unquestionably* an improvement) instead of being relegated to an appendix.

Professor Kautzsch, in his preface, touches upon the need of an accurate and accessible translation of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, in view of the extreme importance of this whole literature for the study of the N.T. and of N.T. times. It has been a difficult task, and it has taken time, to accomplish the work, of which the first instalment lies before us. Each book has been entrusted to one who has made long and special study of the questions connected with it, and

[1] *Die Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*; von E. Kautzsch. Freiburg i. B: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898. Erste Lieferung. Pf. 50.

hence in this series, more than in the *Altes Testament*, each man is responsible for his own work. It is claimed as a merit of the new translation that the reader can always see what text underlies the rendering, and on what grounds any deviations from it rest. A careful and exhaustive introduction is to be prefixed to each book, and the copious footnotes will supply the necessary commentary.

It is expected that the work will be completed in from 24–30 parts, within the space of a year. Each number costs on an average 50 Pf. (6d.), and the whole cost to subscribers will in no case exceed 15 shillings. Orders are received only for the *whole* work.

It will interest our readers to see the complete list of subjects and authors. This is as follows :—

The *Book of Enoch* and the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*	G. Beer.
The Proem and Bks. iii.–v. of the *Sibylline Oracles*	F. Blass.
The *Assumption of Moses*	C. Clemen.
The *Fourth Book of Maccabees*	A. Deissmann.
The *Apocalypsis Mosis*	C. Fuchs.
The *Ezra-Apocalypse* (*i.e.* 2 Es)	H. Gunkel.
The *Third Book of Ezra* (*i.e.* 1 Es)	H. Guthe.
The *Second Book of Maccabees*	A. Kamphausen.
The *First* and *Third Books of Maccabees*, and the *Testament of Naphtali* acc. to Heb. text	E. Kautzsch.
The *Psalms of Solomon*	R. Kittel.
The *Book of Jubilees*	E. Littmann.
The Books of *Tobit* and *Judith*	M. Löhr.
The *Book of Baruch*, with the *Epistle of Jeremy* and the *Additions to Daniel*	W. Rothstein.
The *Prayer of Manasseh*, *Additions to Esther*, *Sirach* (chs. 39–49 acc. to the recently discovered Heb. text), and the *Apocalypse of Baruch*	V. Ryssel.
The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*	F. Schnapp.
The *Wisdom of Solomon*	K. Siegfried.
The *Letter of Aristeas*	P. Wendland.

The first instalment of the work contains Guthe's *Third Book of Ezra* and part of Kautzsch's *First Maccabees*.

Guthe has anything but a high opinion of the historical value of 1 Esdras, as illustrated, *e.g.*, by the Story of the Three Pages. Rather would he class it with many other products of the later Jewish literature, which take liberties with older writings in order to find in these a clothing and a support for ruling ideas of their own day. Since the book is used constantly by Josephus, its date cannot be later than the beginning of our era. Guthe's translation is based upon the text of O. Fritzsche in his *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. græce* (Leipzig, 1871), but takes account also of Swete's edition of LXX, and of the so-called Lucianic recension (ed. Lagarde).

Enough of Kautzsch's introduction to *First Maccabees* is contained in the issue before us to show the extreme care and accuracy of his work. We turn with interest to discover his opinion as to the meaning of the name 'Maccabee' (Μακκαβαῖος), which acc. to 1 Mac 2^4 (cf. v.^{66}) was originally the surname of Judas alone, but was later applied to the whole family, and finally (*e.g.* in the title of the so-called *Third Maccabees*) to all champions of the Jewish religion against the Greeks. Assuming that *maḳḳābî* was the original form of the name, Kautzsch finds the most probable derivation to be from the Aram. *maḳḳābā* (Heb. מַקֶּבֶת, Jg 4^{21}, etc.), 'hammer,' so that *maḳḳābî* would be = 'the hammerer.' It is true that *maḳḳābā* is not the hammer (battle-axe) of war or even of the smith, but the workman's hammer; still this derivation appears to Kautzsch preferable to that contended for by Curtiss, from מַכְבִּי 'extinguisher,' 'quencher' (of strife; cf. Is 43^{17}). —The original language of the book, Kautzsch is inclined to think, was 'Hebrew' in the strict sense, and not Palestinian-Aramaic.—The author may have had written 'sources' at his disposal; in any case, neither he nor anyone else invented the whole detailed history of Judas. Kautzsch is disposed, for various reasons, to seek this author amongst the Sadducees. We have not space to do more than refer to the discussion of the genuineness of the numerous documents that profess to be quoted in 1 Mac, the chronology of the book, and the date of its composition, all of which show the thoroughness we expect from the editor.

The debt of the theological world to Professor Kautzsch and to the firm of J. C. B. Mohr, which was great already, has been very materially increased by the editing and the publishing of this work, which is *simply indispensable to every student either of the Old Testament or of the New.*

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

The Throng and the Touch.

By the Rev. Charles Neil, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthias, Poplar.

'Who is it that touched Me?'—Luke viii. 45 (R.V.).

In treating miracles as acted parables expositors require to exercise much care and a sound judgment. Otherwise they will be led into a habit of allegorizing in a manner which tends to the losing sight of the special truths intended to be taught, and leaves a sense of dissatisfaction, possibly disgust, upon the minds of thoughtful and educated people. This unfortunate method of interpretation is much to be regretted in the case of our Lord's miracles, which are capable of being profitably and interestingly handled without it. All of them, when studied in a natural manner, present certain plain, consolatory, and practically useful lessons, as well as the fundamental and saving truths of the gospel. On these lines we propose to deal with the case of the woman who on her touching our Lord's garments was made whole.

In examining this miracle of mercy, let us first notice the consolation to be directly derived from it in regard to deliverance from temporal ills. To a casual reader it might appear that the cure was encouraging, and afforded comfort only to those placed in exactly like circumstances as herself, who lived about 30 A.D., and were in reach of the Saviour. How, it may be asked by a person now suffering from a serious or incurable malady, can the record of this case help me? The access to Palestine is easy enough, and gladly would I undertake the journey, but there will be found no Saviour for me to touch and be made whole. Instead of deriving consolation from the narrative, it rather proves discouraging and disappointing; it tantalizes me with the mention of blessings entirely out of my power to secure. But after all is this a correct view of the matter? Are we really less favourably situated as to physical benefits than those who resided at Palestine during our Lord's lifetime? Has not the account of this and other miracles of mercy led to men's establishment of hospitals with their attendant advantages for all classes of the community? Admittedly, there are a far larger annual average of persons who recover from diseases, and are relieved of suffering through medical skill and tender nursing to-day, than throughout the whole of our Lord's earthly ministry.

A sufferer, however, who was tempted to complain, might still further ask, 'Why were not more—in fact all—of the sick healed during our Lord's stay on earth, and in our times too?' This is really to raise the well-worn subject of the philosophy of pain, and, without going very deeply into it, a few simple answers can be readily given. In the present fallen state of man, the healing of all sufferers, or the doing away with all or even a large amount of disease, would be productive of more harm than good. What restraints to morality would thereby be removed! The drunkard and the dissolute, the defilers of the flesh would pursue their vicious courses to an extent too alarming to contemplate. The sober and the pure, except in rare cases, would become the easy victims of enticing and sinful companions. Besides, if there were no suffering, how selfish and unsympathetic, cold-hearted and hard-hearted must all of us become. Few, indeed, stop to think how much we owe to the existence of physical suffering in the present economy. It is through the mystery of pain that we have tender feelings, and are led to kindly offices which tend to make life worth living.

Our Lord, by His miracles of healing the blind, the dumb, the deaf, the sick, the halt, the maimed, taught us that He sympathized with us, and that we should sympathize with each other, and do all in our power to alleviate human suffering. He also taught us that one of the blessings in His kingdom, when fully established, would be freedom from pain, and restoration to perfect health. He has given the world the assurance that He, as the Head of Redeemed Humanity, is Lord over diseases in their various forms and over death itself, and that His followers hereafter will be free from all the ills to which flesh is now heir. This note of comfort is ours equally with that of the woman who was healed of her distressing infirmity.

We are now prepared to consider the teaching of this miracle viewed as an acted parable, and

behold, as in a mirror, the working of Divine grace in the soul. In doing so, let us first observe *the way* in which the woman obtained her physical, no less than her spiritual blessing, and we shall find it full of instruction to ourselves. Consider how she acted. She had doubtless heard of the fame of Christ; that He was a heavenly-sent Teacher and Healer; that all who came under His notice, and within the sphere of His influence, and exhibited faith, were immediately made whole, and received in themselves the thrill of health. Perceiving, then, the law of the kingdom of God that approach to the Saviour in faith leads to the bestowment of Divine favours for body and soul, she came behind the Saviour and touched the tassel which hung over the back of His garments, and was at once made whole. In all this how applicable is the narrative to ourselves, without resorting to fanciful methods of interpretation. We learn that the prime condition for receiving blessings of all kinds in the kingdom of heaven is coming to Christ, coming in the exercise of faith, touching even if it be but, so to speak, the border of His garment.

In the next place, observe *the nature of this woman's faith*, concerning which there has been much discussion. Did she show little or great, weak or strong faith? It is not easy to give a definite answer to such inquiries. For all true faith in its first efforts is in some respects weak, and in some respects strong; in no case is it perfect at any stage. Undoubtedly in the instance before us there was a certain want of intelligence, and the existence of some superstitious feelings. Possibly, too, her shrinking modesty, and desire to avoid the observations of the crowd, might have been in measure the result of defective moral courage. She might have sought to filch a blessing unawares from the Saviour Himself. But despite the lowest estimate which may be formed of her faith, and after all possible deductions that can be made from its worthiness—still she had faith, real genuine faith in the full power of Jesus as the heavenly-endowed Physician to heal all brought within the direct circle of His personal influence. None of the crowd on that occasion exercised such an act of faith as did this poor suffering woman. The rest thronged Christ, but she alone touched Him. Her faith had, according to her knowledge, clearly some elements of strength. Just witness how the woman, weakened through her long and painful disease, yet was enabled to struggle and wrestle with the crowd until she made her way so as to actually get next to the Saviour, and touch His garment. How implicitly, too, did she believe in His Divine healing power. She was convinced that he could perform His miracles without even word or action. Her faith, though perhaps child-like, was a faith without doubts or fears, a faith without wavering. Such a faith she possessed; though it might not be what we should call a well-instructed faith, yet it was one which the Saviour recognized and rewarded. Judged by orthodox standards, her faith might be called weak; but viewed in the light of its moral accompaniments, it was faith that deserved to be called strong.

The account of the events after her healing shows what hopeful elements there were in her faith. Our Lord, who knew what was in man, and understood the latent capacities for good or evil in those who approached Him, saw that her faith was capable of being educated and elevated. He perceived that her faith, which had proved sufficient to obtain temporal mercies, if a little further instructed, would be capable of receiving spiritual mercies. Hence our Lord asked, 'Who touched Me?' Whereupon the woman openly confessed Him before the assembled crowd. Having passed through this trying ordeal, her faith now became an exact example to us in days when miracles have long ceased, concerning the method in which spiritual blessings are to be secured. The words now addressed by Jesus, 'Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole of thy plague; go in peace,' belong without any forced application to all who exercise like faith to that of this woman, who, on the occasion before us, proved herself a true daughter of Abraham.

Having thus passed in a simple and natural manner to the higher teaching of this miracle, we can now without a strained construction, or one which would offend the most sensitive or severe critic, refer to some of the minor points in the narrative which are capable of spiritual application. For instance, the failure of all the physicians previously consulted by the woman may be well used as an illustration both of the folly of seeking remedies for spiritual diseases from merely earthly teachers and by human methods, and also of the wisdom on the part of the sinner or backslider turning forthwith in simple faith to the Saviour as

the one never-failing and always available Physician of the soul.

In conclusion, we would remember that our faith in these days of religious enlightenment ought to be more instructed than that of this woman whose case we have been considering. For, as we have seen, it is one of the laws of the kingdom of God that we are to act according to our light. But though this should be the case, still it is to be feared that few of us equal in regard to its moral accompaniments the faith exhibited either by the Syrophœnician woman, or the woman who was healed by touching our Lord's garments on His way to raise Jairus' daughter.

The Unity of Deuteronomy.

By Professor Ed. König, Ph.D., D.D., Rostock.

II.

5. The principal consideration which led Steuernagel to his new partition of Deuteronomy, was the interchange of 'thou' and 'ye' in addressing Israel.

(*a*) All that Steuernagel himself asserts regarding this interchange, is as follows:—(α) 'For instance, in 5^{1-28} Israel is addressed in the 2nd plur., only in the Decalogue 5^{6-18} in the 2nd sing. Similarly, in 12^{1-12} we find the 2nd plur., in $12^{13ff.}$ the 2nd sing.' (*Dt*, 1898, p. iii.). This is simply the statement of a fact, it is no argument, and when he adds that in chap. 28 the 2nd sing., and in chap. 29 the 2nd plur. is employed, this is not even an accurate statement of fact, for from 28^{62} onwards there is a preference for the 2nd plur., and to this usage 29^{1b} attaches itself. (β) In his dissertation *Der Rahmen des Dt* (1894, p. 4) he remarks, 'This interchange seems to be no fortuitous one, for one observes that the narrative portions regularly contain the plural form of address, whereas in the other portions down to 9^{7a} the people is almost uniformly addressed in the singular number. Where, on the other hand, in these sections there is a change of number, this is the case for the most part in sentences of a formal character ($6^{1-3.\ 17f.}\ 8^{1}$) or in sentences whose omission does not disturb the context ($6^{14}\ 7^{5.\ 7.\ 8a.\ 25a}$). Only from 10^{12} onwards is the state of the case different as regards this change of number.' In *Dt* (1898, p. 37) he calls the section 10^{12}–11^{32} 'transitions to the communication of the law,' and merely adds, 'In these there is a network of singular and plural elements interwoven with one another.' Why, then, has he based upon this change of number the judgment that in Dt 5 ff. a document Sg and a document Pl are combined? Because this change of number appears to him to be no fortuitous one. And why? Because in the narrative sections of Dt 5–11 the plural is preferred, whereas in the other portions down to 9^{7a} the singular is mostly employed. But may not this circumstance be connected with deeper reasons? May not the change of number be due to syntactical laws and psychological motives? Steuernagel has not put this preliminary question, but I have done so, having, in connexion with another syntactical investigation, examined also this change of number. Not only have I put the preliminary question, but I have found the answer to it.

(*b*) First of all, I investigated this change of number *in the Book of Dt itself*. The result is as follows:—

(α) The transition from the 2nd *sing.* to the 2nd *plur.* appears to be in Dt traceable to the following considerations. Above all, it is to be observed that the collective notion 'Israel' could be construed with a singular before it and a plural after it, like other collectives (see my *Syntax*, § 346 d). In this way, apart from 'behold . . . you' ($1^{8}\ 4^{5}\ 11^{26}$; cf. my *Syntax*, § 344 g, 348 n) we may explain the sing. 'hear' (שְׁמַע) before 'O Israel' with the subsequent 'your' ($4^{1}\ 5^{1}\ 20^{3}$ †). The same consideration accounts for the sing. 'take heed' (הִשָּׁמֶר) and the 'you,' etc. ($24^{8ab.\ 9ab}\ 25^{17ab}$). Nay, this collective character of the word 'Israel' has a still wider scope. It involves at least the abstract possibility that the word may be replaced by 'thou' or 'ye,' and if anyone should propose to explain in this way some of the

instances where the address begins with 'thou' and is continued with 'ye' (8^1 9^7, etc.), no absolute veto could be laid upon such a procedure. For elsewhere also collectives are represented by the singular at the outset, but farther on by the plural (cf. my *Syntax*, § 346 k, l, p). But if, after all, the question still arises why the speaker in certain instances forgot the 'thou' and preferred the 'ye,' I believe the following answers may be given.

The following plural may in many instances have an enumerative or frequentative sense: the 'thou shalt fear Jahweh thy God' (6^{13}) is followed by 'ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are round about you' (v.[14]). The people, which in 6^{13} is addressed as 'thou,' may then be involuntarily divided into its tribes and individuals (v.[14]), because there were various kinds of idolatry on the borders of the territories of Israel. The same phenomenon is repeated in $6^{15f.}$ Likewise, in the בָּכֶם of 7^{4b} the many instances of idolatry may be in view which might emerge in connexion with the many marriages (v.[3]). Besides, a following וְהִשְׁמִידְכֶם מַהֵר might be intended, which has escaped the notice of Steuernagel, and then the תַּעֲשֶׂה of the Samaritan (not mentioned by Steuernagel) in 7^{5a} loses its last support. Again, in 7^7 the pronoun 'you' might naturally be assimilated to the 'more in number.' 7^{12a} may be frequentative. Compare especially 'thine hand' with 'ye shall burn' ($7^{24f.}$). The kings (7^{24}) were subjected to the whole nation and essentially at the same time, but the burning of the images (7^{25}) could take place only at different times in particular cities and villages. In 8^1 the 'ye shall observe,' etc., looks to the numerous future generations of Israel. In the same way we may explain the 'ye shall surely perish' of 8^{19b}. The different instances of rebellion against Jahweh may be in view in 9^{7b}, where the יצאתם of the Sam. appears to me the preferable reading, as corresponding with the subsequent בֹּאֲכֶם ('ye came'). Specially clear appears to be this disintegration of the nation of Israel in 10^{15b} to which $10^{16f.}$ was assimilated. Perhaps $11^{8b.\ 9}$ should be explained in the same way. In 11^{10} the new section begins again with 'thou,' by which the singular Israel is most naturally represented. Hence this אַתָּה is not to be set aside in favour of the אַתֶּם of the Samaritan. Rather may the following יצאתם of the M.T. have arisen from יצאת on account of the following מִשָּׁם, a point which Steuernagel has overlooked. Also 11^{11a} looks to the future of the people.

Let us compare, further, 'your children' (11^2) and 'your sons' (12^{12}) with 'thy son,' etc. (12^{18}). It is the many future generations and the many peoples that are contemplated by the 'ye' of 13^{4b} [Eng.^{3b}] $^{8a\alpha}$. Quite natural was the form of expression, 'ye are the children of the Lord' (14^1). The 'unto Him ye shall hearken' (18^{15}) is certainly a necessary element of the address. Steuernagel (*Dt*, 1898, *ad loc.*) explains these words as a secondary addition. He has not observed that the plural verb might be an assimilation to the preceding 'of thy brethren.' Neither is וַעֲשִׂיתֶם ('then shall ye do,' 19^{19}) 'an ancient copyist's error' (Steuernagel, *op. cit.* p. 74). Note that the plural שֹׁפְטִים precedes. In the same way the 'ye' of 20^{2a} may look to the 'people' of 20^{2b}. Further, plural subject and plural object correspond in 20^{18}, as does plural with plural and singular with singular 23^{5ab}. A plurality of Israelites are also referred to in 24^{4b} if the Sam. תחטיאו is correct. To the same category may belong 27^{11}; observe also the plural 'the stars of heaven' in 28^{62}. The many instances of idolatry of future generations are probably in view in the plural of 32^{16-18}.

It is possible also that in several instances the singular is avoided in addressing Israel, in order to prevent collision with the 'thou' by which Moses or God is addressed (cf. 9^{10}–10^5 $13^{3b.\ 4b}$).

(β) The transition from the *plural* to the *singular* form of address may be intended to have partly a collective partly an individualizing effect, and in either case to arrest strongly the attention of the hearers.

This transition has the collective effect when the 'thou' is used to designate the people as in 4^{29}, where the Samaritan rightly offers the reading ובקשת, and where the transition to 'thou' may be owing to 'Jahweh thy God.' This is the cause of the transition in 6^{15} ('Jahweh thy God'), 6^{17b} (for in $6^{18f.}$ the whole nation is plainly intended), and in 7^6 ('for thou art a holy people'). In 7^{8b} the speaker returned to the employment of 'thou,' which predominated in $7^{1ff.}$, and in view of 7^9 we do not need to postulate a reading ויפרכם מ׳. Compare, further, 7^{12b} ('Jahweh thy God . . . which He sware unto thy fathers') 8^2 9^1 ('hear, O Israel') 10^{12} 12^1 $14^{2.\ 21a}$ ('thou art an holy people'). This transition to 'thou' has at the

same time in view to touch the audience by the tone of earnestness. This shows itself with special clearness in 'that thou mightest fear Jahweh thy God' (6^{2}). Hence probably we may explain why in Dt one does not meet with 'Jahweh *your* God' so often as 'Jahweh *thy* God' (cf. 4^{25} [Sam. 'your God'] $10^{9.20}$, etc., $12^{7b.9b}$ [Sam. 'your God']; the Samaritan has added אלהיכ, 'thy God,' other twelve times [$6^{12.18}$ 10^{13} 14^{2b} 15^{4} $16^{2b.15}$ 17^{10} $18^{5b.12a}$ 28^{59} 30^{8}], and has dropped it only in 9^{5}). In this expression the 'thou' is primarily collective, as it is surely in the constant קרבך, 'thy midst' (4^{3} 6^{15} 7^{21} $13^{2.6.12.14.15}$ 16^{11} $17^{2.7}$ 18^{15} $19^{19f.}$ $21^{9.21}$ $22^{21.24}$ 23^{17} 24^{7} 26^{11} 28^{43}). In any case, the collective notion 'people,' according to the syntactical analogy (see my *Syntax*, § 346 d), might be construed equally with the plural or the singular ($27^{1b.2a.4ab}$ $28^{62b.68b}$ [the Sam. offers in both places the plural] $29^{1f.}$ 30^{18} [Sam. אתמ]).

Let us now examine another set of passages, where we have the transition from *plural* to *singular*. 7^{25} begins with 'the graven images of their gods shall ye burn with fire,' and continues, 'thou shalt not desire the silver or gold that is on them,' etc. Alongside of this I would place $11^{11ab.14b}$ $12^{5b\beta}$ [Sam. באתמ]. In 12^{13} the 'thou' corresponds with 'in every place.' The singular appears to me to be distributive in 13^{1b} [Sam. תוסיפו]^{8b} like 'the stranger' and 'thy' in 14^{21}. Add to this 4^{34} [Sam. עיניכמ] 29^{2} [Eng.^{3}]$^{4\ ex.}$ [in the last-cited passage the Sam. offers נעליכמ ונ']. For the memory of every individual member of the nation is to be stirred up; and 'thine own eyes' would be a better rendering than 'thine eyes.' In the above passages the singular has an individualizing effect.

But both sets of passages, in which the address passes over from the *plural* to the *singular*, have this in common that the address is meant to be made more impressive by the choice of the singular. After I had perceived this main purpose of the change from 2nd *plur.* to 2nd *sing.*, I was astonished to read as the result of Steuernagel's examination that 'the plural portions of Dt 5-11 have for their object to inform regarding the origin of the law, while the singular portions exhort to loyalty to Jahweh' (*Dt*, 1898, pp. 20 f.). For this aim of the singular sections coincides with the arresting or parenetic tendency which naturally belongs to the confidential or individualizing 'thou.'

Further, the 'thou' with which Moses, the direct receiver of the law, had to be addressed, appears to have its rôle to play. For along with 'which I command you' (4^{2} $11^{13.22.27f.}$ 12^{11} 13^{1} $27^{1.4}$ 28^{14}) we find the much more frequent 'which I command thee' (4^{40} $6^{2.6}$ 7^{11} $8^{1.11}$ 10^{13} 11^{8} $12^{14.28}$ 13^{19} $15^{5.11.15}$ $19^{7.9}$ $24^{18.28}$ 26^{16} 27^{10} $28^{1.13.15}$ $30^{2.8.11.16}$), and at least in 11^{8} [where the Sam. has מצוה אתכמ], the above suggestion appears to me a likely one.

In any case, it being a fact that the collective notion 'Israel' would suit either the form of address with 'thou' or with 'ye,' the 'thou' or the 'ye' which was due to any of the above-mentioned causes might readily be retained even if the same motive did not continue at work in all the subsequent instances. It is so, perhaps, in 7^{8a} $12^{13ff.}$ $14^{21bff.}$ Finally, there came to be the following possibility. A striving after variety might occasion the transition from the one form of address to the other, in order to bring about a pleasing equipoise of the two forms of expression. This motive has, perhaps, been at work, *e.g.*, in 11^{16}, if the explanation is not that particular instances of pernicious idolatry are meant to be distinguished.

(*To be concluded.*)

Requests and Replies.

On page 495 of the eighth volume of *The Expository Times* occurs a remarkable statement by Dr. C. A. Briggs, in the midst of one of his interesting papers on the 'Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah.' After giving an attractive arrangement of that piece of the Wisdom of Jesus which describes His royal judgment (Mt 25[31-46]), he says: 'The following couplet was probably added by the Evangelist:

"And these shall go away into eternal punishment;
But the righteous into eternal life."'

This declaration has played so prominent a part in all discussions on future retribution that one is naturally led to ask whether those who have paid particular attention to the subject are prepared to follow Dr. Briggs; and, if so, what will be the effect upon their views? The ordinary student will probably feel that the application of such methods to the words recorded in the Gospels is leading him on to the quicksands.—F. F. B.

THE view your correspondent ascribes to Dr. Briggs, that Mt 25[46] was added by the evangelist, is held by Dr. Wendt and Dr. Bernhard Weiss. I suppose the ground of the opinion is that the statement wears an aspect of dogmatic reflection foreign to the manner of Jesus, and that the parable is complete without it. The possibility of reflections being attached by the evangelists to narratives of Christ's words and deeds is generally acknowledged. For example, Mk 7[19], last clause in R.V., '*This He said*, making all meats clean,' is an instance. The evangelist indicates that the effect of our Lord's teaching on that occasion was to make all meats clean. Such added reflections need cause no trouble when they do not state anything out of harmony with our Lord's own words.

A. B. BRUCE.

Glasgow.

In Mt 9[35], if the καὶ before κηρύσσων were rendered 'both,' the two clauses introduced respectively with καὶ κηρύσσων and καὶ θεραπεύων would be in explanatory apposition to διδάσκων. By this translation we have emphasis laid on 'preaching *and healing*' as parts of 'teaching,' an emphasis which to my mind is exceedingly necessary to a right understanding of the miracles; and we remove what seems to be something of a pleonasm in the mere conjunction of 'teaching and preaching,'—as though there were no mutual inclusion, and only parallel connection. But perhaps there is something in the grammar against me, which my eye has missed.—R. B.

THE phrase περιῆγεν . . . διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων . . . καὶ θεραπεύων occurs twice in St. Matthew (4[23] 9[35]). In both instances it appears to be a summary of our Lord's itinerant ministry in Galilee. St. Mark, in a corresponding passage, stops at διδάσκων (6[6]); St. Matthew at once limits διδάσκων by adding ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, and expands it by proceeding καὶ κηρύσσων . . . καὶ θεραπεύων, κ.τ.λ. The question is whether the expansion merely interprets διδ. ἐν ταῖς συν. αὐτῶν, or refers to other activities.

Your correspondent's view is, I think, grammatically possible; comp. Lk 2[46], καθεζόμενον . . . καὶ ἀκούοντα . . . καὶ ἐπερωτῶντα (R.V. 'sitting . . . both hearing and asking them questions'). But, on exegetical grounds, I prefer the ordinary interpretation. To construe καὶ κηρ. καὶ θερ. as in apposition to διδ. ἐν τ. συν. αὐτ. (1) limits the ministry in the towns and villages of Galilee to the synagogues, whereas it certainly included street preaching (Lk 13[26]); and (2) it represents the synagogue as the usual scene of the miracles of healing, whereas other passages show that the majority of these miracles were wrought in open places, where our Lord was surrounded by a multitude.

On the other hand, the usual rendering, 'Jesus went about . . . teaching in their synagogues, and preaching . . ., and healing all manner of disease' (R.V.), includes every form of ministerial work—the synagogue homily, the street or field preaching, and the working of cures among the crowd who flocked to the latter (ἐν τῷ λαῷ, Mt 4[23]). Of course, the last of these three activities grew out of the first and second, and stood in a real and important relation to them; but this, although true, does not appear on the surface of the simple synoptic narrative. Nor is διδάσκων καὶ κηρύσσων really pleonastic. Though κηρύσσων may be used of synagogue teaching (Mk 1[39], Lk 4[44], Ac 9[20]), it is specially applicable to the more public and direct proclamation of the kingdom to the crowd outside. 'Teaching' and 'preaching' present Christ's instructions in two different aspects, and the words may therefore be associated without pleonasm; see Mt 11[1], Ac 28[31].

H. B. SWETE.

Cambridge.

Sermonettes on the Golden Texts.

By the Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A., Aberdeen.

I.

'Blessed are they that keep His testimonies, and that seek Him with the whole heart.'—Ps. cxix. 2.

The word 'keep' is one that has a considerable variety of meaning in the English language. It is one of those words that must exasperate a foreigner in trying to learn our language. When he finds it used in such a phrase as to keep the garden, in the sense of to till it, and to keep in the heart, in the sense of to remember, and to keep the feast, meaning to celebrate it, and so on, it is almost more than could be expected of one unaccustomed to the intricacies of our speech, that he should keep his temper as well.

There is no obscurity here, however, to anyone familiar with our tongue. We read of the man in the parable who kept his pound carefully wrapt in a napkin. That was a wrong kind of keeping. It was put to no use. Do not keep the testimonies in any such way. They are not something simply to be stored away and kept intact in the memory. It is told of Mary, again, that she 'kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart.' That is liker what we have to do with the testimonies. It is what the Psalmist evidently did. The law of the Lord was a great and endless wonder to him. He never ceased to marvel at its beauty, and could not get words enough to describe his awe and admiration of it.

But it is not enough to ponder on God's law. To keep it in any true and worthy sense means to observe it, to put it into practice in our lives. You know how, if you have many things to do during the day, a good plan is to jot them all down in a notebook, in case some of them might escape your memory. Some people, when an idea strikes them, note it down at once, lest it might escape them again. I have heard of some men, even in the night-time when in bed, if a helpful and suggestive thought occurred to them, getting up there and then, and making a note of it, lest they might forget it by the morning. Well, the truest way to keep God's testimonies is to put them in practice, to write them, as it were, upon the tablet of your life. They are yours then in the most lasting way. They become a part of yourself. You are a 'living epistle.'

Yes, but it is an epistle 'written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God.' That is one thing about the testimonies, namely, that the more you try to keep them, the more you will feel your utter inability of your own power to do so; yea, not only to keep them, but even to interpret them, for God's commandment is exceeding broad. What we need for the understanding of His law is God Himself as the Interpreter, and, above all, for the keeping of it, we need His gracious help. Blessed, therefore, are they that seek Him with the whole heart.

With the whole heart, heartily; that is the important thing. If you got an invitation to spend a holiday at a friend's house, it would mean everything whether it was a hearty invitation or not. If you thought he did not quite mean it, and was only asking you in a conventional sort of way, you would not be likely to accept the invitation; but if you were sure it was a hearty request, that would give all the pleasure in going. Just so must it be in seeking God. It must be a genuine, whole-hearted search if we would expect Him to reveal His presence to us. And then, to the hearty seeker, He will not fail to give a large and loving response.

II.

'The word of our God shall stand for ever.'—Isa. xl. 8.

People have often been mistaken in their ideas as to the things that would last, from the days of Noah's ark and the tower of Babel downwards. What a grand-looking scheme that was of the building of the tower! Had a company been formed, and shares been issued in connection with it, they would have been enthusiastically subscribed for. And yet the whole thing turned out a gigantic bubble. Noah, on the other hand, with his ark scheme, found not a single supporter. Yet that would have been a very profitable speculation. There's money in it, people say of some mercantile proposal. There was more than money in that scheme of Noah's, there was life in it. And that is what is true of God's Word. There is life in it,

and that's why it lasts. The 'vital spark of heavenly flame' is there, and nothing can stay its prospering in the thing whereto God hath sent it. There is a sense in which it is the height of presumption for man to speak of upholding God's Word; that is, if it be meant thereby that, but for man's upholding, the Word would not stand.

And so, too, with that other part of the common phrase,—upholding and defending. The defending is good and needful in its way, but if it be implied that the Word of God might be overthrown but for man's defence of it, and that there is any call to tremble for the Ark, we are making a great mistake and cherishing a needless fear. That was a good reply Spurgeon once gave to someone who had been expressing anxiety, in his presence, about the future of the Bible, and saying that something would need to be done in the way of defending it from the attacks of assailants. 'Defend the Bible!' said Spurgeon, 'why, how would you defend a lion? Open his cage door and let him out, and he will need no other defence.' And so, give the Bible free scope, and it will be its own grand defence, and win its gracious way.

Certainly it has not been for want of efforts to overthrow it that the Word of God stands. Let us be thankful for those efforts. They have only helped to test 'the impregnable Rock.' Change of view and loss there have been of various kinds, but change and loss have been but gain, in leading to a better grasp of the Divine meaning, and a firmer assurance of the indestructible nature of the Word. We sometimes say, and often correctly enough, of the introduction of some new thing, that it has come to stay; but never was that truer of anything than of God's Word,—it has come to stay.

But what benefit, it might be said, will it be, even though the Word stand for ever, if men come and go, if all flesh is grass, if we are only like the grass that grows and withers? What benefit will the abiding Word be to us in our fleeting life? Ah, but that is only one aspect of human life. It is life in connexion with the world that is fleeting; but there is also a life in connexion with the Word. The Old Testament says, 'All flesh is grass.' The New Testament goes even further, and says, 'The world passeth away.' But if the New Testament goes beyond the Old in its declaration of the temporary nature of all things earthly, it goes beyond the Old, too, in its manifestation of the permanent view of life. The Old Testament says, 'The Word of God abideth.' The New says, 'He that doeth the will of God abideth.' It has a clear and triumphant note for the individual. Yes, if, even as regards the grass, according to the song,

> Ilka blade o' grass keps (catches) its ain drap o' dew,

how much more may mortal man find, in the eternal Word, that which shall be as the dew to his soul, the refreshing, transfiguring element, not renewing for a brief day only, but after the power of an endless life!

What a multitude of meetings, such as none can number, has taken place between men and God through the Word! And just as, in the world, there are certain towns and cities characterized, more than others, by meetings between parted friends,—such as seaports where steamers from the Colonies or foreign parts arrive,—so, in God's Word, there are great texts, golden texts, whither many anxious, needy, sinful men and women have come, and there found God as the strength of their life and their portion for ever. There are grand, heart-filling texts, where many, as John Knox put it, have first cast anchor, and have realized how true, in the highest sense, may be the poet's line—

> Fill my empty heart with a word.

III.

'Ye shall seek Me, and find Me, when ye search for Me with all your heart.'—JER. xxix. 13.

As we have had the thought of this text several times before us of late, let us look at it here in another aspect. The text tells us of a seeking that will not be fruitless. Let us consider some of the vain pursuits of life.

Some pursuits are vain because you cannot overtake what you pursue. We have all tried, in our time, to catch our own shadow, but that is a thing we soon learn to give up attempting. And many a butterfly chase you have had, have you not? The butterflies themselves seemed to enter into the spirit of it, and lure you on, flitting from flower to flower just when you almost had them; the only result of the chase, perhaps, being that you got lost yourself, and there was a fine hue and cry till your mother found you again. Well, we have had many a vain pursuit since then, some

of us. We have given up the butterflies, but we find that other things, too, take wings to themselves and fly away.

People everywhere are pursuing happiness; in a thousand different ways, it may be, but, all the same, the universal wish is, 'I want to be happy.' But there is something very curious about happiness, for while, the more you pursue her, the less likely are you to overtake her, yet, if you just leave her alone, and pay no attention to her, probably she will come up to you of her own accord, like a coy maiden, and say, as Ruth to Naomi, 'Whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge.' Give up the pursuit as a vain one, and think only of duty, of what is right, and you are most likely to find that happiness, instead of the pursued, will become the pursuer. That was a very good advice that Mr. Barrie's sentimental hero, of the unsentimental name, gave to Elspeth when about to part from her—'When I am away, try for a whole day to be better than you ever were before, and think of nothing else, and then, when prayer-time comes, you will see that you have been happy without knowing it.' The author was writing, doubtless, out of his own experience there. Try it for yourselves, and you will see how well it works.

But, again, some pursuits are vain because, even if you do overtake the object of your pursuit, it is worthless. It is not worth the trouble and pains and anxiety and cost you have spent upon it. You get it in your hand at last, and the bubble bursts. You catch it after great effort, and it is only dry stubble. Not only as children but in manhood, and even in old age, we may still be pursuing very profitless things. I read recently of an old man, bordering upon a hundred, who sat in his chair at the door of his house, and would tell those who stopped, in passing, to speak to him, that in a few months he would be a hundred years old, and then they would put him in the papers. His ambition, the object of his pursuit, was to reach the hundred, and to be publicly mentioned in the papers as a centenarian. Poor man, with the experience of a century behind him, was there nothing higher than that to set his heart upon? How different from that beautiful satisfaction of aged Simeon, when at last he held the infant Saviour in his arms, and said, 'Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word: for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation'!

What are you after? we sometimes say to one when we do not see his drift, what object he has in view. What are you after, I would say to you, in that life's journey you are just beginning? What are you after? Will your pursuits only turn out to be as the dry stubble, when the journey is ending? Ah, that's just the worst time too, to find then that all you've got is only chaff. One might stand it at the beginning, with the hope of better things in new attempts; but, at the end, to find but the stubble is a bitter, bitter discovery. But there is one pursuit that will never end 'in shallows and in miseries,' even though it lead 'o'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent.' Look to Christ. Take Him early as your Saviour and Guide. Strive to live as He would have you live; and then, whatever you may gain or lose as to the world, you will find God and gain your life.

IV.

'For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.'—LUKE ii. 11.

THE kingdom of God, Jesus said, cometh not with observation, and neither did the King of the kingdom come with observation. Born in a manger,

> Guests rudely went and came, where slept the royal Child.

Some, however, were interested. The angels knew what His coming meant. And those mysterious Wise Men from the East had some dim idea of the wondrous event. But the shepherds were honoured above all with the outburst of angelic song and the glad tidings of great joy. Yes, there was another—Herod—to whom a hint of the tidings came, but it brought no joy to his heart. The angels' song would have been no song to him had he heard it. Rather would he have said with Mephistopheles—

> Discord I hear, and intolerable jangling.

The angels knew it was true, and they sang; the Wise Men hoped it was true, and they followed; Herod feared it was true, and he plotted; the shepherds were told it was true, and they glorified and praised God.

This was the gift of God long foretold, first whispered of at Eden's gate, seen afar off by patriarch's eye, waited for by devout souls, sung of by inspired bards. And now, at last, it is not

prophet, priest, or king, but humble shepherds, that are honoured with the first intimation of the good news.

Unto you is born a Saviour. It was news for the world, but as truly it was news for them. God's gift was to the world, but it is also unto you and unto me. It was not a mere general blessing that was not to mean much to any individual soul. The worst of general blessings, as a rule, is that they do not signify much in any particular case. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduces his budget, and has the pleasure of intimating a large surplus, he goes on to tell of his intention, in consequence, to reduce taxation in this or that line. But though it may mean a big reduction taken in the lump, it does not amount to much in the case of any individual householder. Altogether it may be a huge sum, but the relief comes to very little in the separate homes of the people. It was not so, however, with God's unspeakable Gift. It was not merely a Saviour to the world, but a Saviour unto each. Each needs, and each may have, the Saviour in all His fulness.

Some years ago, according to a reporter of the scene, during the visit of the Duke and Duchess of York to Ireland, as they were driving in state one day through the streets of Dublin, an old woman, bent and tattered, was standing on the kerbstone in front of the crowd. The Duchess happened to notice her in passing, and gave her a kindly smile. There was no time for more, but the old woman noticed the smile that was meant for her, and she sent after the retreating carriage a characteristic Irish blessing. But what would you think if the royal pair had gone to Ireland specially for the purpose of blessing that poor creature, not with a smile merely, but by taking her into the carriage beside them? The idea is an extravagant one. They went, as we know, with no little purpose of that kind. They went with a view to establishing a kindlier relationship between the two countries, Great Britain and Ireland,—a vague sort of blessing that did not mean much in any particular case. But Jesus did not come merely to establish a kindlier relationship between heaven and earth. He came to bless and to satisfy each separate soul. Just as we each need and get a satisfying portion in our daily meals for the bodily wants, so the soul's hunger is supplied in Christ as the bread of life.

Christmas is a season specially associated with the sending of gifts. Is it not the very essence of Christianity to think of others, as God thought of us? A colonial post-office is an interesting scene about the time the Christmas mail is being sent off. Here is a soldier filling in a postal order for a pound, perhaps, to his old father and mother in the home country; and here is a man, who has prospered in the land of his adoption, sending a few pounds to a brother or sister not so well off; and the same sort of thing goes on up to the closing of the mail. After all, as Barrie says, 'Money may be always a beautiful thing. It is we that make it grimy.' Not at Christmas time only, however, but at all times, let us learn in some way or other to be givers; and not merely for the sake of others, but for our own sake. To grasp is the great end of the world's commandment, but to give is the end of that Saviour's Who gave Himself for us.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

KNOX'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. Edited by C. J. Guthrie, Q.C. (*A. & C. Black.* Crown 8vo, pp. xxvi, 364. 7s. 6d.)

There are few more thankless, as there are few more needless, tasks than the expurgating or the modernizing of a book. For if the book will not do unless it is expurgated, it had best be left alone; and if it will not do unless it is modernized, it will not do better then. So when we heard that Mr. Guthrie had set himself the task of modernizing Knox's *History*, we had little hope of his enterprise.

But it is a great success. For Mr. Guthrie has had the wisdom and restraint to give us Knox himself, not Knox either expurgated or modernized He has modernized the spelling and nothing else. He has also broken up the sentences into paragraphs and the paragraphs into chapters, but that

takes nothing from Knox, and is all clear gain to us. He has, moreover, filled the text with accurate illustrations and the margins with useful notes. That also is clear gain. And if he has left out some of the documents that are accessible elsewhere and some of the repetitions, there is certainly little loss in that. So it is a success. A handsome, loyal book. Knox will not suffer. And now the greatness of Knox as a writer and reformer will be discovered by numerous surprised and delighted readers.

THE POETRY AND THE RELIGION OF THE PSALMS. By James Robertson, D.D. (*Blackwood.* 8vo, pp. 360. 12s.)

The Croall Lectures of 1893–94 have been kept back till now that the author might have time to become his own critic. For the lectures here published are neither literary, as the word 'poetry' might suggest, nor devotional, as the word 'religion' might suggest. They are critical of the present position of Psalter criticism. They stand counter to prevailing scholarship, and know that they do so. Hence the author felt that 'when one's conclusions do not agree with the current views of those who are regarded as authorities, it becomes him at least not to be rash in the publication of them.'

The current views are these: the Prophets are older than the Law, and the Psalms are latest of all. Now, as we know, Dr. Robertson does not believe that the Prophets are older than the Law. He wrote his Baird Lectures to prove that they were not. He is not concerned to deny the relative date of the Psalter to the other two. But he contends that a religion and a poetry such as we find in the Psalter was possible and probable in the time of the early Jewish monarchy. He would therefore place the Psalter as a whole, and at least as a possibility, before the writings of the prophets; and so, between his Baird and Croall Lectures he would restore the old order—Law, Psalter, Prophets.

Is the task beyond him? Well, it is a great task. For there have been giants in the earth recently, and Professor Robertson has to overthrow their works. But his equipment is great. In some respects his qualification is unique, as in his minute acquaintance with the soil and the feeling of Palestine. He does not reveal, though quite likely he possesses, a familiarity with the latest continental brochure on Old Testament criticism, but he does reveal a close, persistent, wakeful study of the Psalms themselves and of the land which gave them birth.

THE CRITICAL REVIEW. Edited by Principal S. D. F. Salmond, D.D., F.E.I.S. (*T. & T. Clark.* Vol. viii. 8vo, pp. 504. 7s. 6d.)

The two things most characteristic of the *Critical* are its fairness and its timeliness. Coming out once a quarter, it is surprising how completely it sweeps the literature of the quarter, how little it leaves behind. And when we remember that its reviews are signed, it is equally surprising how impartial on the whole they are. A pleasant feature of the new volume is the editor's occasional estimate of the theological and philosophical periodicals, terse and telling. It is, all in all, a magazine of indispensable value.

THEOLOGIA PECTORIS. By J. M. Hodgson, M.A., D.Sc., D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* Crown 8vo, pp. 207. 3s. 6d.)

The chief error in the history of the Church is the persistent notion that a belief is good for us whether we believe it or not. The Reformation discovered the mistake, and rectified it not a little. But it will outlast all reformations, and still need to be reformed. The grand truth in Christianity is the truth that Christ died for our sins. But it is nothing to me until 'I lay *my* sins on Jesus.' That is the emphasis of Dr. Hodgson's book. He does not say that our faith brings the truth into existence; he does say it is no truth to us till we accept it. So we may wrangle about the Trinity and the authority of Scripture, and be very rigid in our creed; but it is barren as the red-ribbed sand until our creed becomes our life. A timely, useful, fruitful book.

THE TUTORIAL LATIN DICTIONARY. By F. G. Plaistowe, M.A. (*Clive.* pp. 524. 6s. 6d.)

This is the best beginner's Latin Dictionary we have seen. It contains etymology as well as meaning. It gives the authority for every use of the word, so that the learner can tell at once if it is good latinity or not, if it is found in prose or poetry. Then it is brief, clearly printed, and strongly bound.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL. By John Kennedy, M.A., D.D. (*Eyre & Spottiswoode.* Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 219. 6s.)

It is the latest (we did not say the last) grand plea for the authenticity of Daniel. And it is the best possible plea. It comes from Christ. It centres the matter in Christ. It works out from all that Daniel has been and is to the devout follower of the Lord Jesus. And then when the great spiritual things in Daniel are apprehended, and when it is shown that they have always been held along with its authenticity, then, but not till then, the minute things which the critics have discovered are faced. And they seem really quite easily disposed of.

How admirably the book is got up, with its plate engravings and fine paper.

THE AGE OF THE MACCABEES. By A. W. Streane, D.D. (*Eyre & Spottiswoode.* Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 277. 6s.)

The work of a scholar. It is not only a brief history, accurate and therefore trustworthy; it is also an account and estimate of the literature of the period. It is a handbook that will find a place notwithstanding that so many small books on the Maccabean Age have been recently published. It will be more serviceable for the student of literature than any of them. And above all other things, this is the book that will bridge the gap between the Old Testament and the New. For that gulf has its ideas to reckon with as well as its facts, much more indeed than its facts. And these ideas are in the literature it produced, of which Dr. Streane has given so clear and succinct an estimate.

Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode have also published *The Teacher's Prayer Book*, being an edition of the Book of Common Prayer, with copious notes by Dr. Alfred Barry, and a glossary by Mr. Mayhew. The glossary is the same as we have in the 'Aids,' and it is the best of the small glossaries next to that which Canon Driver has just published.

JESUS CHRIST AND HIS SURROUNDINGS. By the Rev. Norman L. Walker, D.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* Crown 8vo, pp. 240. 3s. 6d.)

Who could have expected that the idea which Dr. Walker works so happily should have remained unworked till now? But it will be so till the end. Whenever an independent mind approaches the study of the life of Christ, new treasure will come forth. Dr. Walker first describes Christ's relations to the natural world. That done, he recalls His handling of the world of spirits. And in that way he goes over the whole course of our Lord's earthly activity, and gives us (notwithstanding his disclaimer of any such intention) a new 'Life' of Christ, while at the same time each group of kindred subjects stands apart, a single completed picture. Take the simplest chapter as the easiest illustration. Its title is 'The Outlying Races.' First we see the Wise Men come from the East, and the wide significance of their visit is made clear to us; next we hear the question of the 'Greeks' who came to Philip, 'Sir, we would see Jesus'; then follows the touching incident of the Syrophœnician woman; and the chapter passes on by Jacob's Well, the good Samaritan, and the Capernaum Centurion, till the end comes with the Roman Soldiers at the Cross.

THE GOSPEL OF JOY. By Stopford A. Brooke. (*Isbister.* Crown 8vo, pp. 378. 6s.)

Was not the Gospel of Joy the announcement, 'Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour'? Well, Stopford Brooke would not deny, but he would have another meaning in his mind for that word 'Saviour' than we might have. The key of his position will be found in a sermon about the middle of the volume: 'The Simplicity of Christ.' Christianity is not creed, says the sermon, does not need creed, cannot do with creed. Creed is of the intellect, Christianity is of the heart. So the trinity, the divinity of Christ, the infallible authority of the Bible or of the Church, the necessity of miracle—all is of the intellect and unnecessary. Not even true, he adds, for intellect itself has now disproved them, thus devouring its own children. 'Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and thou shalt find rest to thy soul'—that, says Stopford Brooke, is Christianity. And in what chastity of style, what melody of musical words he says it!

GREAT BOOKS. By the very Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D. (*Isbister.* Crown 8vo, pp. 235. 5s.)

Of making books about books there is no end. But Dean Farrar can do it better than the multitude. It is a gift. There must be the irrepres-

sible hunger of the hand for a book—for a book just as a book. The rest follows. And then, what books about great books ought to do for us—send us to the great books themselves—is done almost in spite of the writer. Dean Farrar does this consciously. He does not care whether or not you read his own fluent volume; or he does not greatly care; but he does care greatly that you should read Shakespeare and Bunyan and Dante and Milton and Thomas à Kempis.

THE RANGE OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By Richard Waddy Moss. (*Kelly*. 8vo, pp. 114. 2s. 6d.)

The range of Christian experience is in proportion to the range of man's nature. Take man's nature (without the irritating reservations) as body, soul, spirit. Then it is necessary to emphasize the fact that man has to be Christian over body, soul, and spirit. It is necessary, and it is most momentous. This is the way in which our Christian religion is most likely to make appeal to-day. And Professor Waddy Moss has chosen a truly practical subject for his Fernley Lecture.

THE CHRISTIAN AGE. (*Lobb & Bertram*. 4to, pp 416. 4s. 6d.)

Even the best known papers run the risk of dropping out of sight if they are not constantly kept before us. For new men come and new papers claim their notice. The *Christian Age*, we fancy, is in no danger of being forgotten yet. But we are glad of this opportunity of mentioning its features. These, in brief, are excellent sermons by American preachers, good portraits and sketches of famous men, and especially a fine providing of anecdotes and illustrations from all available sources.

THE SOUL HERE AND HEREAFTER By R. E. Hutton. (*Longmans*. Crown 8vo, pp. 258. 6s.)

There is a good deal of miscellaneous discussion of the soul here and hereafter in Mr. Hutton's book, as you might expect, but its theme is purgatory. Mr. Hutton believes in purgatory. He cannot get on without it. He does not see how the Church can get on without it. For he says the only alternatives are: (1) that death itself is a sufficient purgatory, or (2) that souls can enter heaven imperfect. Now, of these two doctrines, the first, he says, has not a shred of scriptural support, and the second is quite contradictory of Holy Writ. But what of the redeemed in the Apocalyptic vision? They came through the great tribulation, but that was on earth. They were in heaven not because the tribulation had purified their character, but because they had washed it in the blood of the Lamb. And so, is not the whole matter just there? Either tribulation fits us for heaven—and then purgatory is necessary, ay, such a purgatory as Mr. Hutton seems to contemplate with approval, whose 'pain is like that of hell'; or else we are made fit for the inheritance of the saints in light by faith in that Christ whose blood is able to cleanse from all sin. And so, to say that God will not receive us into heaven until we have gone through a period of purgatory is to say that the blood of Christ is *not* able to cleanse from all sin.

A SERIOUS CALL. By William Law. Edited by J. H. Overton, D.D. (*Macmillan*. 8vo, pp. xx, 313. 8s. 6d. net.)

Under the general editorship of the Rev. Frederic Relton, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington, Messrs. Macmillan have undertaken to publish a series of volumes of which the title is 'The English Theological Library.' The first volume gives us a clue to the character of the series.

The volumes are to be produced in Macmillan's best manner, the editing is to be entrusted to specialists, and the general editor is to take a responsible supervision. They are not produced to look well merely; they are to be fine examples of conscientious modern editing, and, so far as can be discerned from the first volume and the promised list, they are to be the works of the most catholic English theologians.

The Serious Call needs nothing to be said for it as a start. Canon Overton's introduction is judicial and penetrating—to be read by the most accomplished student of Law. And his notes, which are chiefly on obsolescent words, are restrained and pointed. It is the *edition de luxe* of *The Serious Call*.

SPIRITUAL APPREHENSION. By the Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, D.D. (*Macmillan*. Crown 8vo, pp. 354. 6s.)

Dr. Llewelyn Davies is the grand old man of broad-churchism. He is also its last survivor.

Having no gospel, having only a kindly encouragement to us to do well and it will be well with us, the broad-church movement has perished. Dr. Llewelyn Davies only is escaped alone to tell us what it was. But if we had a thousand advocates we should not be better told, for Dr. Llewelyn Davies believes as heartily in the broad church to-day as ever he did; and, more than that, he actually thinks the broad church is alive and vigorous to-day. He thinks that it has swallowed up the fat kine of evangelicalism, and that nowhere in the land will you hear of the blood of Christ that is able to cleanse from all sin. This volume is old and new; but the new sermons are as good as the old, and the old sermons are as bad as the new. They have all one happy hopelessness.

BELIEF AND LIFE. By T. Rhondda Williams. (*Horace Marshall.* Crown 8vo, pp. 385. 3s. 6d.)

The reason why it is dangerous for one man to preach another's sermons is that a congregation of even the poorest discernment knows they are not the preacher's own. That is not the reason why it is wrong, but it is the reason why it is dangerous. For minds are more varied than bodies, perhaps because they are more complex. And a mind like that of Mr. Williams treating a familiar text like Jn 1^{12}, 'As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God,' treats it in a way that is just its own and no other mind's. In all our experience of sermons, we never but once came upon a text treated in the same way by two different men. The one was Mr. Spurgeon, and the other, we think, Dr. Parker, and plagiarism was out of the question.

But about Mr. Williams. His sermons are impressively original. That is why they suggest the subject of originality. And they are original because they are faithful first-hand studies of their texts. Mr. Williams has learned his theology, but he does not think that the Bible was made for it. And so he is quite entitled to compliment his congregation (as he does in the dedication) on 'their love of truth for its own sake.'

TYPICAL CHRISTIAN LEADERS. By John Clifford, M.A., D.D. (*H. Marshall.* Crown 8vo, pp. 275. 3s. 6d.)

The modern minister plays many parts. Among the rest he has sometimes to preach 'funeral sermons.' Dr. Clifford takes to it kindly. It is his way to preach a funeral sermon not only for the departed of his own flock, but also for all who depart out of this world, if they are great and good. And he does it well, as one might say he would. Here are thirteen funeral sermons, the first three being for Mr. Gladstone, the last for Burne-Jones. It is excellent easy reading, and it is broad, generous appreciation.

Messrs. Horace Marshall & Son have also published (1) a new volume of their 'Present-Day Preachers.' It is by the Dean of Norwich, and its title is striking, *The Immortality of Memory* (crown 8vo, pp. 244, with portrait, 3s. 6d.). So, however, are its contents, intensely practical and earnest; not a word lost, not a word overpressed. (2) The second volume of Dr. Parker's *Studies in Texts* (crown 8vo, pp. 210, 3s. 6d.), which, besides the irresistibly clever studies in (and all around) the texts, contains an incredibly frank 'literary retrospect.'

THE LORD'S PRAYER. By the late E. M. Goulburn, D.D. (*Murray.* Crown 8vo, pp. 302. 6s.)

It is not easy now to say anything new on the Lord's Prayer. It is easier now to produce a fresh explanation of the Lord's Prayer than ever it was. Which of those statements is true? The second without a doubt. For the more, like a rich mine, it is laid open, the more avenues of approach are there, the more plainly do its golden treasures display themselves. Dean Goulburn proves the truth of that. You may have Maurice and Dods and Farrar, and all the popular manuals, but you must add Goulburn on the Lord's Prayer. His manner is the expository turned to immediate devotional account. But it is the ripe fruit of long cultivation and much pruning. He kept the lectures beside him, we are told, preaching them often, revising them constantly.

THE DOCUMENTS OF THE HEXATEUCH. By W. E. Addis, M.A. (*Nutt.* 8vo, pp. 485. 10s. 6d.)

Among the opponents of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, not less than among its advocates, is found the desire to distinguish the documents of which the Hexateuch is said to be composed. Accordingly there have been several attempts made to meet the desire, chiefly by variety of colour or of letterpress. Mr. Addis adopts a better method. He prints the component

documents separately. Thus we see each writer's work as a whole—so far at least as it is a whole—and we can read it undistractedly.

This is the second and concluding volume of the work. The first volume was published so long ago as 1892. The delay has been somewhat vexatious, but it has perhaps at least as much gain as loss. For the material that has gathered since 1892 for the better presentation of this subject is considerable in bulk and of first-rate importance. Mr. Addis himself enumerates no fewer than one-and-twenty works, and they include Dr. Driver's *Introduction*. Of all this literature Mr. Addis has made good use. Indeed, his knowledge of the subject is unsurpassable. He has the broad grasp and he has the minute introspection. This volume contains the Deuteronomic and the priestly documents. And not the least valuable part of it is the series of notes to be found at the bottom of every page.

CREATION RECORDS. By George St. Clair. (*Nutt*. 8vo, pp. 492. 10s. 6d.)

Mr. St. Clair's name will return to memory when we mention his excellent book, *Buried Cities and Bible Countries*. He is an archæologist of no mean reputation. He is a persistent student of other archæologists. In the new volume he has gathered a great amount of material from the Egyptian records, especially the Book of the Dead, bearing on gods and men. There are *creation records*, but there are also records of most things in creation. Still the interest is mainly religious, and the book, though it demands digging and sorting, will prove a mine of illustrative matter on the earlier narratives of Genesis.

FOR THE LORD'S TABLE. By the Rev. Charles Jerdan, M.A., LL.B. (*Oliphant*. Crown, 8vo, pp. 409. 5s.)

Fifty communion addresses; the appropriate texts, the appropriate word on them; the helpful combination of spiritual exhortation and intellectual instruction; the very atmosphere of quiet befitting devotion—that is Mr. Jerdan's book. Why does it recall Rabbi Duncan? Because Rabbi Duncan's *At the Communion Table* has been the high-water mark, and we cannot recall anything (except for a moment perhaps Mr. Waterston's little book) that comes between it and Mr. Jerdan. Not that these are the very words we should have said or should still say on these texts; but that they suggest thoughts and lay down lines. And then the publishers have given the book so handsome a form, and given it at so cheap a price.

THE OLDEST TRADE IN THE WORLD. By the Rev. George H. Morrison, M.A. (*Oliphant*. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 183. 1s. 6d.)

With this volume Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier close their series of Children's Sermons called 'The Golden Nails.' They close it with a volume that has as many signs of possessing the 'gift' as any volume in the series. Though this is the last volume to be published, this is not the last we shall hear of these books. They have vitality and appropriateness enough to live on and be to us a standard of preaching to children, behind which we dare not pass. And Mr. Morrison's book will not lower the standard. We think it has raised it somewhat. For it has a fine scorn of the petty devices that smaller men use to catch the children's attention. It has also respect enough for the children to clothe its thought in careful literary language. The man who finds the faces of the little ones turned to him and keeps them with sermons such as this has a good conscience toward God.

Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier have also published *Bible Stories without Names*, by the Rev. Harry Smith, M.A. (fcap. 8vo, pp. 167, 1s. 6d.), the second volume of 'The Children's Sunday.' And we shall just mention, without characterizing, the new volume of the 'Famous Scots.' It is *Thomas Reid*, by Professor Campbell Fraser. What more need be said?

THE CRY FROM THE SEA. By the Rev. T. S. Treanor, M.A. (*R.T.S.* Crown, 8vo, pp. 256.)

The problem for the Religious Tract Society is where to find books that are good and not goody. They have found one on the Goodwin Sands. It is not the first they have found there, so they know the quality. The stir and rush of seafaring, wave-breasting life; the simple preaching of the evangelical faith: these two combined make the book.

PRESENT-DAY TRACTS. Vol. xiv. (*R.T.S.* Crown, 8vo. 2s. 6d.)

There are six tracts as usual in this latest (and last?) volume of the series, and here are their titles:—(1) The Testimony of the Earlier Prophetic Writers to the Primal Religion of Israel, by Dr.

Stanley Leathes; (2) Who say ye that I am? by the late Dr. H. R. Reynolds; (3) Some Modern Views of Zoroastrianism, by the Rev. M. Kaufmann; (4) Non-Christian Religions, by Dr. Murray Mitchell; (5) The Trinity in Sacred History, by Dr. D. W. Simon; (6) Culture and Christianity, by Mr. Kaufmann. So there is a mixture, a mixture of quality as well as of kind. The R.T.S. (and Dr. Stanley Leathes) are not always quite sure what we have to defend ourselves against. But Dr. Simon is always reasonable and Mr. Kaufmann is always practical and modern. The one irresistible defence, however, is the defence of Dr. Reynolds.

The R.T.S. has issued the yearly volumes of *The Leisure Hour* (pp. 812, 8s.) and *The Sunday at Home* (pp. 812, 8s.). Both contain several strong healthy novels, for which the price of the volume would be cheerfully paid twice over if they were published separately. They also contain many short tales, and many articles of much present-day interest. But it is enough to recall their existence, should it have been for the moment forgotten, and their exceeding fitness for a Christmas or New Year's gift.

The R.T.S. has also published *Under the Shadow of St. Paul's* (crown 8vo, pp. 190), a page from the history of London, by Henry Johnson; and a cardboard model of the Temple in the time of our Lord, by Maud A. Duthoit, with a recommendatory note by Col. Conder. It is a highly ingenious device; it has all the interest of the best of toys, but it is far more than a toy, it is an avenue to the most accurate knowledge of a difficult subject.

IN THE DAY OF THE CROSS. By the Rev. W. M. Clow, B.D. (*Sands*. Crown 8vo, pp. 309. 3s. 6d.)

'A course of sermons,' adds the author, 'on the men and women and some of the notable things of the day of the crucifixion of Jesus.' The idea was happily conceived, and Mr. Clow has turned it to good account. It is not that so many men and women came within the light that streamed from the cross of Christ; it is rather that their personality is so marked and separate. It is not that much is told us of them, it is that the little is so illuminating, as if it were not light but fire rather, which burned the accidental away and left them standing in their essential character. There are Caiaphas and Pilate and Herod of course. But there are also Barabbas and Simon and Pilate's wife. Some would call Mr. Clow's sermons old-fashioned, but they are old-fashioned as Dr. Maclaren's are. Exposition and application go hand in hand. And beneath the old threefold division there often lies an appeal that cuts more sharply than any two-edged sword.

AIDS TO BELIEF. By the Rev. W. H. Langhorne, M.A. (*Elliot Stock*. Crown 8vo, pp. 194. 5s.)

This book is too expensive, else it would have served its purpose very well. Its purpose is to lead the ignorant or half-hearted into a reasonable faith in the trustworthiness of the New Testament. This is just what is most needed. And Mr. Langhorne does not overdrive. He is evidently quite alive to the difference between accident and essential. It is a well-meant, well-accomplished volume, of considerable apologetic value.

Mr. Elliot Stock has also published (1) *The Book of Job*, a revised text with Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. G. H. Fielding; (2) a cheap edition of Dr. Barrett's *The Intermediate State*, and (3) of *Our Christian Year*, both well-known books that deserve a yet wider circulation; (4) *Christ Come and Coming*, a little volume of wholesome writing on the subject of Christ's Second Coming—very wholesome and very helpful we have found it.

A New Commentary on St. Mark.[1]

When the See of Durham took away from Cambridge and scholarship first Dr. Lightfoot and then Dr. Westcott, it seemed as if the great series of Cambridge Commentaries had come to an end. But it was not so. Dr. Hort had already done some work which we are now receiving with much appreciation. And Dr. Swete, after many valuable labours in other fields, has at last produced a commentary on a New Testament book.

We are told in the *Life of Dr. Hort* that when the three Cambridge scholars, Lightfoot, Westcott,

[1] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. By Henry Barclay Swete, D.D., Litt.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. Macmillan. 8vo, pp. cx, 402. 15s.

Hort, spoke one to another about writing commentaries on the whole New Testament, the Synoptic Gospels were given to Hort. And so that was the part of the scheme on which next to nothing was done. Lightfoot published Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and left Notes on Thessalonians, with portions of Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians; Westcott published St. John's Gospel, St. John's Epistles, and Hebrews. Hort published nothing. But now Dr. Swete has taken up the work that was left undone by Hort. He has given us the first-fruits of his labour in this volume on St. Mark.

Dr. Swete has prepared himself for this task as perhaps none of his predecessors had done. His knowledge of the Greek versions, for example, is unsurpassed by any worker of to-day, and far surpasses that of any worker of twenty years ago. And it is a most useful field of study. Dr. Swete illustrates or illuminates every other phrase in the New Testament from the Septuagint, and we are enabled to see how unmistakably the one language is the child of the other.

Dr. Swete has further a most intimate acquaintance with recent literature, and that apparently in all the departments of his subject. In this way he lets us see that on the books of the Bible we must always be receiving new commentaries. For new discoveries in many fields are constantly coming to us, epigraphical and apocryphal discoveries especially; and more than that, new interpretations become accepted, so that there is a certain fashion (and a most proper thing too) in biblical interpretation as in all things else. Of the new things bearing especially on St. Mark may be mentioned Mr. Conybeare's discovery in 1891 that in an Armenian MS. of the Gospels, of A.D. 986, the last twelve verses of that Gospel are attributed to 'the presbyter Ariston.' Dr. Swete is inclined to agree with Mr. Conybeare in believing that Aristion is meant, and that the verses are actually of his writing.

The Introduction, in the end of which this about Aristion is found, is a masterly piece of work, minutely accurate to a marvel, but comprehensive also, and marking the latest result of modern scholarship. The dissertations which Lightfoot and Westcott familiarized us with will be missed. But they are not forgotten. In a companion volume we hope soon to find them. This volume is large enough of itself.

Have we forgotten to characterize the book as a whole? It is in every respect a fit companion for the great Cambridge Commentaries that went before it.

The New Testament Miracles.[1]

Dr. Abbott is, without any exception that we can recall, the last man from whom we should have expected a book like this. It is a full, painstaking record of all the miracles attributed to the sainted Thomas Becket. Now Dr. Abbott does not believe in miracles. He does not believe in any of the miracles recorded in the Bible. He does not believe any more in any of the miracles recorded in ecclesiastical history. What has he to do with St. Thomas and his miracles?

You may think he records the miracles at the Canterbury shrine in order to discredit them. Not at all. Of his own belief or disbelief in them there is not a word till the very end of the second volume. Then he dismisses the matter easily by saying that when they were genuine, as in cases of healing actually accomplished at the saint's tomb, they were due to such a perfectly natural cause as intense emotional excitement. But the proof or disproof of the miracles is not Dr. Abbott's purpose.

He was working on the Gospels. He wished to know what bearing on the credibility of the narrative two or more versions of the same story had. He turned to the different versions that are extant of the miracles of St. Thomas. To make the illustration profitable, he resolved to translate the different versions *in extenso*. 'There you have Benedict, there you have William; compare them for yourself; does the story grow under the later hand or does it stand still? draw your own conclusions.'

So Dr. Abbott seems to say to us. But he draws some conclusions for us. The last brief chapter is, 'Its bearing on New Testament Criticism.' There he says that of those who study the four Biographies, the two Books of Miracles, and the other early traditions relating to St. Thomas of Canterbury, some will find in them wholesale proof and some wholesale disproof of

[1] *St. Thomas of Canterbury*. By Edwin A. Abbott, M.A., D.D. A. & C. Black. 8vo, 2 vols., pp. 333, 326. 24s.

the miracles in the New Testament, but 'a third class—possibly, for some time, a small one—may agree with the present writer in some at least of the following conclusions' :—

(1) In the two Books of St. Thomas's Miracles few or none of the early miracles, and in the Gospels none at all, can be explained by imposture.

(2) In both cases, a clear distinction must be drawn between (*a*) miracles wrought on human nature, which are substantially to be accepted, and (*b*) miracles wrought on non-human nature, *e.g.* bread, wine, water, trees, swine, birds, etc. *The latter are not to be accepted as historical, but as legends explicable from poetry taken as prose* (i.e. *from metaphor regarded as literal*) *or from linguistic errors, or from these two causes combined.*

(3) The power of healing disease through the emotions extends not only to the paralyzed, the deaf, dumb, and lame, but to the blind also, and to those afflicted with skin disease.

(4) Death is sometimes preceded by several hours of apparent lifelessness, so that ordinary observation, and perhaps even average medical skill, may be unable to detect any trace of life. During this period, reanimation may follow from the passionate appeal of a nurse, father, or mother, if uttered under a strong faith in a Power that will raise up the [person alleged to be] dead. Sometimes, even without any such appeal as can be heard by the dead, the strength of the appellant's faith itself may produce the same effect.

Hence it is quite easy to accept the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter. The raising of the widow's son at Nain might also easily be accepted, so far as physiological considerations go. But the objections against it are—1st, that Luke alone inserts it; 2nd, that it is omitted by the parallel narrative of Matthew *in the place where we might expect its insertion*; 3rd, that it shows traces of originating from allegory misunderstood; 4th, that its place in Luke's Gospel—where it comes just before the Lord's words 'the dead are raised'—suggests that the writer may have been predisposed to receive, as literal, some poetical tradition, because the literal version agreed with *the Fitness of Things*: 'How could Jesus say, "The dead *are raised*," if He had not raised at least *two* dead persons?'

The raising of Lazarus is far more credible than the raising at Nain. If critics can hereafter explain the omission of so striking an act by the Synoptists, there would be no difficulty (regard being had to the personality of Jesus) in accepting John's story as substantially correct, unless a strong case could be made out for an allegorical origin.

(5) Two or three accounts of the restoration by St. Thomas of members that had been extracted or cut off, are so extraordinary and well attested, that they deserve the attention of experts. But probably there was no real restoration. So far as concerns the cases of blinding, the eye may have been gashed, but not extracted, and there is evidence to show that, in days when such mutilation was a common punishment for theft, it was recognized that some power of sight might remain.

In any case, even if St. Thomas's miracles of this class could be accepted, the similar miracle assigned by Luke's Gospel alone to Jesus (the restoration of the severed ear to the high priest's servant) could not be accepted, and for three reasons: 1st, it is omitted by the three evangelists who describe the cutting off of the ear; 2nd, one of these, the author of the Fourth Gospel, wrote long after Luke, and must have known Luke's account; his omission of it can best be explained on the ground that he knew it to be based on error; 3rd, its origin is easily explicable as a misunderstanding of an original tradition to the effect that Jesus said, 'Let it be restored to its place.' These words were meant by Jesus to apply to *Peter's sword*, which was to be put back into its sheath; but Luke, or the tradition followed by Luke, took them to mean, 'Let *the ear* be restored to its place.'

Bishop Walsham How.[1]

'Now he is called among you, welcome him. Take him to your hearts. Bishops have gone through various preparations: some have been students; some have spent their time in academic leisure; some have been priests. The training he has gone through has been, if I may reverently say so, nearer to the training of Christ Himself during His painful ministry than any other could be.'

In these words Archbishop Thompson introduced Bishop How to the See of Wakefield. William Walsham How had passed through Oxford before the middle of the century without becoming a Tractarian, and in his only curacy at Kidderminster he wrote, saying, 'But there is such a thing as the duty of fasting. It is to my mind as plain a duty as anything else, and has *always* appeared so. I do not think I *ever once* had a doubt about it. It is utterly different to general self-denial; in short, it is a *particular* self-denial in the matter of eating and drinking at particular times.'

Then he spent twenty-eight years in the Rectory of Whittington, in the county of Salop. And as the years passed, it became evident to everyone that his self-denial was the deepest reality, never self-denial for its own sake, always for the sake of the Master and the brethren. 'As to fasting,' he wrote, 'it is a means and not an end. It is meant to bring the body into a state helpful to a prayerful and watchful spirit. Let it be so used when it effects its purposes. But is it better to lie in bed till church-time, as some do, because they cannot otherwise go through the long morning

[1] *The Life of Bishop Walsham How.* (Isbister. 8vo. 14s.)

service fasting, or to take such simple food as may be found needful to enable both body and spirit to engage profitably in the worship of the Church without impairing their fitness for the ordinary duties of the morning? We really cannot help recoiling with a shudder from the gross carnalism (we can call it nothing else) of words which now lie before us, and which we almost tremble to repeat; in which we are warned that "when we are about to receive the Body and Blood of Christ into our bodies, we should take care that the resting-place of the sacrament be not pre-occupied"!'

Then Canon How was consecrated bishop suffragan for East London, with the title of Bishop of Bedford, and the life of self-denial, the 'painful ministry,' came upon him abundantly. But he loved it still. He refused the Bishopric of Manchester for the love of it. And he would never have accepted the Bishopric of Wakefield had not things become nearly unworkable in London, and had not the newly-formed See offered equal opportunity for the practice of self-denial.

And it was the bravery of self-denial. For there are two kinds of it, the thick-blooded and the thin. He was physically brave. One of the three accidents that befell him in 1892—they come in threes—was a serious carriage one. He was badly hurt, yet he preached within an hour, 'I think better than usual, without notes, to a splendid congregation. M. said she could not listen for thinking of the gallop and jump, but I never thought of it once during the sermon.'

So this was the man they called 'the Children's Bishop.' For he held his strength in hand, and it became as the gentleness of a mother to them.

New Gift Books.

LET the yearly volumes of *Good Words* (Isbister, pp. 860, 7s. 6d.) and of the *Sunday Magazine* (Isbister, pp. 856, 7s. 6d.) have the first place. In the former the feature of most striking distinction is the plate illustration. Not only are these plate impressions softly, restfully executed, but they are also most pleasing in subject. Our fathers would have given much money for these, and would have framed them. In the subject-matter a clear distinction is maintained between *Good Words* and the *Sunday Magazine*. The latter may be read by the most sensitive observer of the Lord's Day; the former may be read all the rest of the week.

Messrs. Nelson & Sons have published ten new volumes for boys and girls. They scarcely need to be described separately, for they are all after the well-known pattern. They are also printed, illustrated, and bound according to the style which, as soon as it is seen, is at once associated with the name of Nelson. It would be impossible, in truth, to produce books more chastely or attractively for their special purpose than the finest of these volumes; and even the smallest and least expensive are, when the others are away, altogether satisfying to the eye.

First there are three at 2s. 6d.: *The Green Toby Jug*, by Mrs. Edwin Hohler. The volume also contains *The Princess who Lived Opposite*. Both are stories for the wee ones. This book is the wee ones' book. The second is *Our Vow*, by E. L. Haverfield. This volume appeals to a rather older race of children. The single story occupies the whole book. The third is for the bigger little boys. It is *King Alfred's Viking*, a story of the First English Fleet, by Charles W. Whistler.

Next there are three published at 3s. 6d.: *The Triple Alliance* is not historical as its name might suggest, but a good, stirring, school story, by Harold Avery. *The Uncharted Island* is a story of the sea, by 'Skelton Kuppord,' a name the boys who love the weird and wonderful are already familiar with. *One Summer by the Sea* is quieter and more domestic, and moves in unexceptionable society. Its author is J. M. Callwell.

There is one volume at 4s. Its author is Lucy Taylor; its title, *Through Peril, Toil, and Pain*. It is a story that carries us back to the reformation of religion in England, a story of the miseries of martyrdom and the triumph of faith in Christ.

Then come three very handsome volumes at 5s. each. The first is *French and English*, by E. Everett-Green. It tells the thrilling tale of Wolfe, and the great struggle to determine whether America should belong to the English or the French. It is one of Miss Everett-Green's 'Tales of English History.' *A Fighter in Green*, by Herbert Hayens (a new name), has all the adventure and all the brigandage which the most restless,

daring stay-at-home could desire to read. The last is a strong, much-moving school story, by Harold Avery, entitled *The Dormitory Flag*. For the average schoolboy it is perhaps the surest to please. Its outward aspect too is most alluring.

On the whole, the boys have the best of it. Have girls ceased to read school stories? Then what do they read instead? Surely they are not so occupied with efforts to beat their brothers at college that they read no stories now at all.

The Christmas gift-books of Messrs. Blackie & Sons have a wide range, both in price and in character. The cheapest is published at 2s. It is called *Chips and Chops, and Other Stories*. It is to be presented to the little ones who can just read, and it is all about fairies and their neighbours.

Two volumes are published at 2s. 6d. The most attractive to look upon is *The Reign of the Princess Naska*. It is in truth the most beautiful book we have seen this season. Of course it carries us off to fairyland. But the average girl will prefer *The Lady Isobel*, by Eliza F. Pollard.

Then there are two at 3s. 6d., one for the girls and one for the boys. Miss Davenport Adams writes the one, its title being *A Girl of To-day*. It is not for very, very young girls, for it carries its readers into the difficult and dangerous places where young men and maidens meet. But it is right true and wholesome. *Courage True Hearts* is one of Gordon Stables' characteristic books for lads. It needs no words to describe or commend it.

The last and greatest of Messrs. Blackie's list is a fine volume by the veteran but ever welcome boys' story-teller, Mr. G. A. Henty. Its title is *Both Sides the Border*, a title that speaks for itself. It is published at six shillings, and is produced in the most lavish style of gold back and olivine edges.

Contributions and Comments.

A Few Old Testament Riddles.

1. Is 33^{17}, Ps $45[^{23}]$. Was the Messiah to be ideally beautiful?

Dr. Skinner remarks, on the former passage, that 'the reluctance of many expositors to interpret this phrase of the Messiah is incomprehensible.' And 'since whatever be the date of the passage the Messianic hope must have been a living idea of Jewish religion, there seems no reason for trying to evade what seems the most natural explanation. On the beauty of the king see Ps 45^{2}.' Duhm, before him, also thought a reference to the Messiah most plausible. But no one has called attention to the difficulty of the parallel line, however we interpret the 'king in his beauty.' Skinner, again following Duhm, sees a reference to the 'spacious and ever-extending dominions of the Messiah.' But is this interpretation a natural one? Hitzig renders אֶרֶץ מַרְחֹקִים 'a land that is very far off,' which agrees with the margin of the Revised Version, and seems to me the most natural version (cf. Is 8^{9}), apart from the consideration of the requirements of parallelism. 'A widely extended land' may, as most think, be the safest rendering. But is the phrase correctly transmitted? The preceding line relative to the 'king' is, I am afraid, equally doubtful. Critics cannot agree as to the reference, and the reason is that the allusion is so incidental. But is this incidental reference probable? In the second part of v.[18] there is a striking corruption (see 'Isaiah,' *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* [Haupt], Hebrew text); may there not be a corruption in v.[17]? I venture therefore to give an emendation which I have introduced among a few addenda at the end of the edition just referred to. It is a description of Jerusalem, and not of the king, which we have before us (cf. vv.[20. 21]).

מִכְלַל יָפְיִ תֶּחֱזֶינָה עֵינֶיךָ
תִּרְאֶינָה עִיר מַחֲמַדֶּיךָ

The Perfection of Beauty thine eyes shall behold,
They shall see the city of thy precious treasures.

For 'Perfection of Beauty,' see Ps 50^{2}, La 2^{15}; for 'thy precious treasures,' see the commentators on Is 64^{10} [11]. Note also the parallelism now restored between Is 33 and Ps 48 (see vv.[3. 13ff]).

Next as to Ps 45^{2} [3]. The difficulty of יָפְיְפִיתָ is well known. In Gesenius-Kautzsch's *Hebrew Grammar* (translation, p. 156), the editor says, 'For the meaningless יפיפית (Ps 45^{3}) read יָפְיְתָ.' A scribal error (dittography) has been perpetuated

by the punctuation, which did not venture to alter the *K*ᵉ*thîbh*. König (*Lehrgebäude*, i. 583) thinks that the first two consonants of the stem are doubled to express the superlative degree; thus the word would mean, 'Thou art exceedingly beautiful.' Haupt ('Psalms,' Hebrew text, Haupt's Old Testament, p. 84) would point יְפֵיפִיתָ (cf. also Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, § 252). None of these views seems to me probable. יָפִיתָ is too short, the line should be a tetrameter. יְפֵיפִיתָ, even if it suited metrically, would be an unlikely form. Besides, there is one quality of the ideal king which on the ordinary view is unmentioned in the psalm, viz. wisdom. This would find a natural place in the description just before the reference to the king's eloquence (cf. 1 K 4^{29} [9] ^{32} [12] 10^{24}). Probably we should read חָכְפָה יְסַפְּתָ. The reading in the Massoretic text was produced either by dittography (after corruption), or by an editorial attempt to fill up the space of partly effaced words.

2. Ezk $8^{3.5}$. What was the 'image of jealousy which provoketh to jealousy'? (v.^{3}). We may safely dismiss the latter words, which are surely an explanatory gloss (see Cornill's note). The 'image of jealousy' (סֶמֶל הַקִּנְאָה) is generally supposed to be the Ashera which Manasseh had placed in the temple, or rather a similar idolatrous object, placed there during the idolatrous reaction in the closing years of the kingdom of Judah. See Dr. Davidson's note in his *Ezekiel*, p. 54f; he avoids a dogmatically expressed decision of this difficult point. Gunkel (*Schöpfung und Chaos*, 141) thinks that the true reading is סֶמֶל הַקָּנֶה, *i.e.* 'form of the reeds,' or, of the reed-monster, *i.e.* the Chaos-monster subjugated by the Light-god (Leviathan). This is too artificial, but Gunkel is on the right track. The phrase 'image of jealousy' is impossible, and we naturally look to Babylonia for light on the passage. Can one doubt what the true reading is? הקנאה should be כַּיְוָן, *i.e. kaivanu* = *kaimanu*, the god of the planet Saturn in Babylonia. כ and ק, both palatals, were very liable to be confounded. From Am 5^{26} we learn that the people of Judah (or part of them), at one time worshipped this deity; we owe the comprehension of the passage to Schrader, though the whole matter is not fully set forth in his valuable work on the Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Old Testament. It was not, however, in the primitive age that the Israelites bore in procession Saccuth or Kaivan, 'their image' (צלמכם 'your image'; so perhaps we should read), but in the time of Ezekiel. The prophet's word for the image is סֶמֶל; it was, if this reading is correct, a statue[1] of Kaivan which he saw 'northward of the altar gate,' in the outer court of the temple at Jerusalem. This reading was apparently known to the late editor of the works of Amos, who (as, following Wellhausen, I have endeavoured to show) inserted Am 5^{26} in lieu of an illegible or too startling passage.[2] It is true, he adopts the term צֶלֶם instead of סֶמֶל. There is, however, just a possibility that סֶמֶל 'statue' is not the right reading in Ezk $8^{3.5}$. Ezekiel may perhaps have written לַמַּס, *i.e. lamas*. *Lamassu* was one of the names for the colossal winged bulls which stood at the entrance of Assyrian and Babylonian palaces and temples. If the received reading of Ezk $8^{3.5}$ is correct (see Cornill), the image of 'jealousy' (rather Kaivan) stood at the entrance (בביאה should be במבוא) of the north gate. It is conceivable that a winged bull of the well-known Babylonian type may have stood there, and that the deity whom the sacred bull represented was Kaivan. Delitzsch (*Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, p. 381) quotes a passage from a cuneiform inscription with the words, 'Thou (O Marduk) art the *lamassu* of my life,' which seems to show that the great gods could be supposed to be in relation to the *lamassê* or *šêdê*. Even apart from this, it is possible that Ezekiel may have given the term *lamas* (which must surely have been well known to many of the Jews) to the imported Babylonian god Kaivan, in the sense (for which see Delitzsch's Dictionary) of protective deity. This view only requires us to read the letters of סמל backwards. The late scribe may be supposed to have known the word סמל but not למס. Ezekiel, as many have remarked, was much impressed by some of the outward forms of Babylonian religion, and doubtless not Ezekiel alone. I hope I am not mistaken in supposing that this suggestion is of some little importance for the history of Jewish religion.

3. Ezk $38^{2.3}$ 39^{1}. 'Gog, prince of Rosh' (E.V.).

It is a remarkable fact that all the proper names in Ezk 38^{1-7}, except Rosh should be, at any rate virtually, included in the Table of the Nations in Gn 10, and von Hammer long ago conjectured the identity of Tiras (Gn 10^{2}) and Rosh. According to Bertholet, who has had the advantage of seeing the advance sheets of Dr. Toy's work on Ezekiel in the series of *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, this eminent scholar connects Rosh with Tiras. To avoid any misunderstanding, I venture to remark that Mr. Herz in the summer of 1897 mentioned to me an attractive view on the origin of Rosh, which he

[1] See the Phœnician evidence in Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 69 (on Dt 4^{6}).

[2] *Expositor*, 1897 (1), pp. 43, 44.

takes to be a false reading. I will not go further into the subject, and shall await with much interest Dr. Toy's solution of this and of the many other problems in the difficult book of Ezekiel.

4. 1 S 12^3, Revised Version, 'Or of whose hand have I taken a ransom to blind mine eyes therewith?' Margin, 'The Sept. has, "win a pair of shoes? answer against me, and I will," etc. See Sir 46^{19}.' Dr. Driver's note on this passage (*Text of Samuel*, pp. 68 f.) is quite satisfactory up to a certain point. 'A pair of shoes' is not what we expect in this context, and the copula can hardly mean 'or even.' Still Am 2^6 8^6 certainly give a certain degree of support to the reading of LXX, and Cowley and Neubauer are evidently not quite sure of the rendering 'a secret gift' which they have given to נעלם in Sir 46^{19}, for they append a note. 'Perhaps נעלים, a pair of sandals.' The whole group of passages has been *virtually* cleared up by Halévy, who, for נעלים in Sir, *l.c.*, reads שִׁלּוּם. He believes that שלום was altered into נעלם by an ancient scribe who was misled by the expression אעלים עיני בו in 1 S 12^3. I venture to think, however, that in all these passages (Am 2^6 8^6, 1 S 12^3, Sir 46^{19}) we should simply correct נעלים (so Am), נעלם (so Sir), and אעלים (1 S) into שִׁלּוּם (Mic 7^3); ע and ש are readily confounded. In 1 S 12^3 we should of course continue with LXX, עֲנוּ בִי, 'witness against me.' It is a pity that the latest commentator (Löhr) has somehow overlooked this.

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

Prayers for the Dead.

I notice that in The Expository Times for November astonishment seems to be expressed that Bishop Welldon should advocate prayers for the dead. The doctrine, however, has always had advocates among the divines of the English Church; it finds expression on tombstones of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the Archbishop of Canterbury has lately told us that it is countenanced by the Church of England. Indeed, a judgment in the ecclesiastical court had already laid down that such was the case, and several bishops have within the last few months expressly stated that it is one of those doctrines which an Anglican is permitted to hold. It is sanctioned by the Communion Office, where at the end of the Prayer for the Church Militant the revisers of 1662 added the commemoration of the faithful departed, beseeching God 'to give us grace so to follow their good examples that *with them* we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom'; while after the administration the priest asks God 'to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' and prays 'that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and *all Thy whole Church* may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion.' Here the double universal ('all' and 'whole') is used in order to include the Church invisible as well as the Church visible.

The doctrine follows logically from the orthodox Anglican belief that the Church visible and the Church invisible form together a single whole, and that between death and the resurrection the souls of the faithful departed pass into the intermediate state of 'Paradise.' If members of the Church visible are benefited by our prayers, it seems to follow that those who have joined the Church invisible must also be benefited by them. The two sides, as it were, of the Church cannot be separated from one another; they constitute together 'the body of Christ.'

A. H. Sayce.

Oxford.

In the foregoing Note Professor Sayce quotes from the Prayer-Book the words, 'that by the merits and death of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins,' and says, 'Here the double universal ("all" and "whole") is used in order to include the Church invisible as well as the Church visible.' Professor Sayce sent this Note just before leaving for Egypt, and we did not observe these sentences till he was gone, else we should have drawn his attention to the fact that in the English of the time of the Prayer-Book 'all the whole' is a mere redundancy, and of frequent occurrence. Not to go outside the Prayer-Book itself, in the *Preface*, as it is called in the editions from 1549 to 1604, or *Concerning the Service of the Church*, as it was named in 1662, we find the expressions twice: 'For they so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once in the year'; 'And where [1662 "whereas"] heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within this realm, some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, some the use of Bangor, some of York, and some of Lincoln: now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use.' But the first verse of Ps 96^1 in the Prayer-Book version will be more familiar: 'O sing unto the Lord a new song; sing unto the Lord all the whole earth.' See also the art. All in the new *Dictionary of the Bible*.—Editor.

Acts xv. 28.

In his note on Ac 15^{34} (The Expository Times, November, p. 89) Professor Blass calls attention to the fact that ἔδοξε τῷ with infinitive occurs nowhere in the New Testament except in St. Luke. He points out that the Letter of the Apostles and Elders (Ac $15^{23\text{-}29}$) is written in a more classical style than most parts of the Acts, and that ἔδοξε with this construction occurring

there (v.[28]) is one of these classical features. I shall be the last to challenge this statement, but we can go further and say: this ἔδοξε (Ac 15[28]) is quite in accordance with the manner in which religious bodies used to formulate their decisions in Jerusalem. Compare the letter sent by Rabban Gamaliel and his collegues to the Jewish Diaspora of Babel, Mede, Greece, and all the other Diasporas (as printed by G. Dalman, *Aramäische Dialektproben*, Leipzig, 1896, p. 3): וּשְׁפַר בְּאַנְפַּי וּבְאַנְפֵי חַבְרַי. There is no better translation for this וּשְׁפַר than ἔδοξε: '*It seemed good* to myself and to my colleagues.'

Surely 'the study in letter-writing,' which J. Rendel Harris has opened for the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (*The Expositor*, September) proves fruitful also for other letters in the New Testament. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Jahve, Ea, and Sin.

SIMULTANEOUSLY with my note on the etymology of יהוה (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. x. p. 48) there appeared in the October number of the *Contemporary Review* a very important article, as it seems to me, by G. Margoliouth, entitled 'The Earliest Religion of the Ancient Hebrews.' Margoliouth, in this article, arrives independently of me at the conclusion that what I have shown in my *Ancient Heb. Tradition* to be the oldest form of *Jahve*, namely, *Ya*, *Ia*, *Yau* (cf. on the latter form, THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. x. p. 42), is identical with the Babylonian divine name *Ea*, which name is well known to be borne in the Semitic texts by the old Sumerian earth-and-water god *En-ki* ('lord of the earth').

Margoliouth goes, however, a step farther—and in this appears to me to consist the special significance of his article—in combining with this identification the rôle of moon-god which I have also shown (*Anc. Heb. Trad.* p. 65) to belong to Ea. As Ea and the Babylonian moon-god Sin frequently exchange rôles, so also, according to Margoliouth, Yah (from which Moses, through connecting the word with the verb *hawah*, 'be,' 'exist,' formed *Yahveh*) was originally symbolized by the figure of the moon. In point of fact quite a number of indications point to this conclusion.

Abraham's father migrated from *Ur* in Chaldæa, the primeval sanctuary of the moon-god on the borders of Babylonia and Arabia, to *Harran* in Mesopotamia, the other primeval moon-temple in the Euphrates region. And when the descendants of Abraham, after manifold wanderings, and after some hundreds of years' stay in Egypt, were to be brought back to Palestine, Moses led them not by the direct road thither, but first of all to a sacred mountain, whose name again was derived from the moon, namely, to *Sinai*, that Yahve might there reveal Himself to them in His majesty. Also Yahveh's name, *Yahve Ẓebaoth* (the moon as king of the heavenly hosts, *i.e.* the stars), is happily fitted by Margoliouth to the same conception. Purposely avoided by Moses as a possible reminder of the times of Terah, this name is used all the more as a designation of Yahveh from Samuel onwards; and if Ezekiel, in his slavish imitation of the Pentateuch, avoids it, after him it comes to the front once more. To the perfectly sufficient evidence adduced by Margoliouth I would add the frequent expression *Hallelû-Yah*, since the etymology of *hallel* is clearly enough to be traced in the Arabic *hilâl*, 'new moon'; and Margoliouth himself has already shown very happily what an important rôle was played even later amongst the Jews by the new moon. Further, that amongst the Arabs the moon originally occupied a more important place than the sun, is proved by the simple fact of the feminine character attributed to the latter. So also among the ancient Sabæans, *Haubas* (the moon as the drier-up of the ocean tide) with *Almâku-hû* ('his lights'; cf. Yahve *Ẓebaoth*) always precedes the sun-goddess. On the other hand, among the Babylonians *Samas* (the sun) was always conceived of as masculine; it is only the Arabian Hammurabi dynasty that furnishes occasionally such personal names as *Samas-ummîa* ('the sun is my mother'), and under the same dynasty we meet with a god *Ilâli* (Arab. *hilâl*, 'new moon') in personal names. But that even as early as Abraham's time the West Semitic moon-cult in Ur was only the symbolic expression of a lofty monotheism (even if not yet the monotheism of Moses and the prophets) is proved not only by the West Semitic system of names (cf. on this point my *Anc. Heb. Trad.* chapter iii.), but also by the remarkable hymn to the moon (*W.A.I.* iv. pl. ix.) cited by Margoliouth. For all that has been brought forward only briefly in this note and for much else (*e.g.* the rôle played by Ea in conjunction with Bel-Merodach as creator of the world, and as friend and protector of Noah upon the occasion of the Deluge), to which I might add a great deal of new matter, I would refer the reader to Margoliouth's article itself, which by way of supplement no theologian will regret reading and studying. FRITZ HOMMEL.

Munich.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Messrs. Blackwood & Sons have published the Inaugural Lecture with which Professor Patrick opened the session and occupied his Chair of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities in the University of Edinburgh. The title of the lecture is *The Conservative Reaction in New Testament Criticism* (8vo, pp. 32, 6d.).

Professor Patrick succeeds a conservative occupancy of his Chair in the person of Professor Charteris. It had been no surprise if he had begun by promising a 'forward movement.' But a forward movement is scarcely possible to-day. Even on the Continent, if we except Professor Holtzmann, struggling to keep together the scattered remnants of Tübingen, and Professors van Manen and Steck, busily engaged scattering the last of these fragments to the winds, there is no forward movement discernible. When Professor Patrick's Chair was founded in 1846 the theory of Baur was dominant. All the traditional views with regard to the authorship, date, and inter-relations of the New Testament books had been set aside, and any opposition to the prevailing theory 'was branded as the infallible index of intellectual narrowness.' Fifty years have passed. By the nearly unanimous consent of even continental scholarship we are back to the dates and decisions which were accepted before Strauss and Baur arose.

Is the criticism of the last fifty years barren of all result then? The stiffest conservative would not say so. He would say that it has been of great service in proving its own inefficiency. The history of criticism, he would say, is the best refutation of criticism. And Professor Patrick, who is not a stiff conservative, does not say so. He says that it has brought us one inestimable benefit. It has taught us to reverse our method of study. Before the Tübingen period, men formed their theory of inspiration first and then went to work on the New Testament; now men go to work on the New Testament unfettered by any theory of inspiration, simply as historical study, and they form their theory of inspiration out of the facts which that study has brought to light.

Professor Cheyne's new book, of which a fuller account is given later, contains a historical exposition of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

This fine poem, as he calls it, this 'holy of holies in the temple of the Old Testament,' as he further describes it, belongs, he believes, to the age of Ezra, and expresses the 'sanctified ambi-

tions of some of the best Judæans' then. It is not a purely imaginary description. It is a deeply felt meditation by 'some tender-hearted, zealous, and enthusiastic man' on certain melancholy facts well known to him and his readers. Of all the poems in its cycle, it is the one 'most obviously occasioned by contemporary historical facts.' What were they? Who is its suffering servant?

In a late prophecy of the Book of Isaiah (57^1) certain unknown martyrdoms are commemorated. The words are—

> The righteous perishes, but no man lays it to heart;
> Men of piety are taken, but none considers
> That for the wickedness (of the time) the righteous is taken.

These martyrdoms, Professor Cheyne thinks, had taken place in the years preceding the arrival of Ezra in Jerusalem. Malachi speaks of certain persons living then as 'fearers of Jehovah,' and intimates that they belonged to the poorer classes. They stood out from the general body of the indifferent as pious men whose poverty only offered a reason to their neighbours for avoiding their religion, and whose 'nonconformity' was troublesome to the tyrannical rich men, who falsely accused them before the judges and obtained their condemnation to death. The great religious thinker of the age of Ezra looked back upon these men and saw them irradiated by the light of a Divine purpose. He fused the different nameless martyrs and confessors into a single colossal form, and identified this ideal personage with the true people of Israel. But in doing so, adds Professor Cheyne, he may very likely have thought of the prophet Jeremiah, who certainly regarded himself and his disciples as conjointly the sole representative of the true Israel.

In *The Homeric Centones*, which the Cambridge Press has published (8vo, pp. 83, 5s.), Professor Rendel Harris has as little to make a book on as ever a man had. Yet he has made a delightful book upon it. You may read it through in less than an hour, but you will read it through. And you have added one item to your stores of knowledge.

The book is written to tell us about the influence of Homer on the early Christian Church. It is natural to expect that Greek-speaking writers should be acquainted with the masterpieces of Greek literature. St. Luke is credited with an acquaintance with Dioscorides. How much more likely that he should know the mightier models of Greek style and speech. There is an early Christian poem, the *Christus Patiens*, long supposed to be the work of Gregory of Nazianzus, which tells the gospel in language borrowed from six plays of Euripides. Mrs. Browning, who attributes the poem to Apollinarius, in her Greek Christian Poets, gives a rendering of its opening verses, and places by their side a translation of the opening verses of Euripides' *Medea*, which they imitate. Here is the *Medea*—

> Oh, would ship *Argo* had not sailed away
> To Colchos by the rough Symplegades!
> Nor ever had been felled, in Pelion's grove,
> The pine, hewn for her side! So she, my queen,
> Medea, had not touched this fatal shore,
> Soul-struck by love of Jason!

And this is the opening of *Christus Patiens*—

> Oh, would the serpent had not glode along
> To Eden's garden-land—nor ever had
> The crafty dragon planted in that grove
> A slimy snare! So she, rib-born of man,
> The wretched mis-led mother of our race,
> Had dared not to dare on beyond worst daring,
> Soul-struck by love of—apples!

But the influence of Homer on the early Church far outweighed the influence of all the rest of the writers of Greece. Professor Blass and Professor Rendel Harris believe that it can be traced in the New Testament itself. There is a phrase in the Book of Acts (27^{41}) which Professor Blass thinks St. Luke deliberately borrowed from

Homer's *Odyssey*. It is translated in our Authorized Version, 'they ran the ship aground.' But the Revisers have changed 'the ship' into 'the vessel,' for the word is most unusual. Thirteen times in the same chapter St. Luke uses the common word for ship (τὸ πλοῖον); in this place alone he uses an obsolete word (ἡ ναῦς). Why did he use it except that it was part of a phrase that was running in his mind? The special form (ἐπικέλλω instead of ἐποκέλλω) of the verb that goes with it is also quite unusual in prose.

There is a still more striking example in St. Luke's Gospel. The Revised Version translates 23^{53} in this way: 'And he took it down, and wrapped it in a linen cloth, and laid it in a tomb that was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain.' But the Cambridge *Codex Bezae* adds: 'and after it had been laid there, he put unto the sepulchre a stone, which twenty men could scarcely roll.' Several years ago Professor Rendel Harris suggested that that interesting addition was due to Homer. He thinks so still, and Professor Blass agrees with him. But whereas Professor Rendel Harris thought that the Homeric line had first appeared in the Latin translation, which is found page for page with the Greek in *Codex Bezae*, Professor Blass believes that St. Luke himself is the author of the sentence. In the first draft of his Gospel he had written these words, a direct recollection of a well-known passage in Homer's *Odyssey* (ix. 240), but left them out in the 'fair copy' which he made for Theophilus.

And there is a more remarkable example still. It is found in the Apocalypse. Says Professor Rendel Harris: 'When St. John wrote the vision of the dragon which attempts to destroy the Man-Child that is born into the world, he had in his mind the vision of Calchas in the second book of the *Iliad*, who narrates the devouring of a brood of nestlings and their mother by a fiery-red dragon.' Then he compares the original language of Rev $12^{1.3}$ with Homer's *Iliad*, ii. 308, and proceeds: 'The object of the dragon is to devour the brood, but this is not permitted in the Apocalypse, where both Mother and Child escape. It is interesting to observe that in the apocalyptic writer's mind, the mother is really a bird, for when the dragon proceeds to persecute her, she takes to herself the two wings of a great eagle, and flies into the desert. Moreover, she has a whole brood of nestlings, and not merely the single Man-Child; for the writer tells us that the dragon proceeds to make war with the remnant of her seed, those, namely, who keep the commands of God and the testimony of Jesus.'

But the purpose of the book is not to show the influence of the Bible of the ancient Greek upon the Christian Bible, it is to trace its influence on early Christian literature, and especially to impart some knowledge, which Professor Rendel Harris has gathered, about the famous Homeric Centones.

It is well known that on the introduction of Christianity into a new country, it was often found expedient to graft the new plant upon the stock of the old institutions of the country. But it has not been often observed that the very Bibles or sacred books already in existence were retained and made the ministers of the Covenant of Grace. The most striking case is the Homeric Cento. Verses or half verses of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* of Homer were pieced together and made to tell the gospel story in poetry. The narrative of the Gospels was transferred from its natural simplicity into a ridiculous mimicry of the reverberating music of the Greek epic. But the device pleased the learned by its ingenuity, and deceived the unlearned by its affected stateliness. And from the second century to the sixteenth the Homeric Centones had a reputation that vied with the genuine Homer on the one hand and the Gospels themselves on the other. When printing was invented, it was not long till a fine edition (1504) of the Homeric Centones issued from the Aldine Press, and within the century no less than five editions were produced. The last of these

editions was adopted as a school-book among the Jesuits.

Whatever else criticism does, it rouses interest. The period of Old Testament history which has hitherto made the feeblest appeal to the interest of the ordinary student is that which followed the Exile. But criticism has been at work upon it. The accepted positions have been challenged. There has been hot controversy and the widest possible divergence of opinion. The post-exilic period is for the moment the most interesting period of all.

The latest writer on the post-exilic period is Professor Cheyne of Oxford. In the winter of 1897–98 Professor Cheyne accepted an invitation to deliver the third series of the 'American Lectures on the History of Religions.' He chose as his subject *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, and delivered six lectures in nine cities of America that winter. The lectures have now been published under the same title by Messrs. Putnams (8vo, pp. 270. 6s.).

A year or two ago, in reviewing Duhm's *Isaiah*, Professor A. B. Davidson spoke playfully of the great literary period of the Maccabees. 'The great writers on the Psalter have shown us how every skirmish of the day had its poet, and how every rise and fall in the spirits of the little army have been photographed in the Psalms which we sing.' Professor Cheyne would probably accept the picture seriously. And so, taking together the Maccabean age and the immediately preceding age, of which he writes the history here, he would find room for the great bulk of the literature of the Old Testament. For in the post-exilic period generally, he places, not only the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, but also Lamentations, Isaiah i.–xxxix. and xl.–lxvi., Micah, Genesis to Joshua, Ruth and Jonah, every one of the Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, and of course Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

Thus Professor Cheyne has abundance of literary material to work upon. He has also great freedom in the way he works upon it. He employs, he tells us, 'the two sister faculties, common-sense and the imagination.' These he brings to bear upon the exegesis and upon the history. 'In exegesis a happy intuition often throws a flood of light upon an obscure passage, and a similar remark is still more applicable to historical reconstruction.' But he has a right to claim that these intuitions are not purely accidental. 'They spring, in exegesis, from sympathy with an author, and a sense of what he can and what he cannot have said; in history, from a sedulously trained imaginative sense of antiquity, supported by a large command of facts.' In short, when the apparent exegesis of a passage will not suit, Professor Cheyne has free recourse to textual emendation; and when the historical facts are not sufficient, 'it devolves upon us,' he says, 'to fill up the deficiencies of the narrative by reasonable conjecture.'

In this way Professor Cheyne reads the history of post-exilic Judaism over again, and comes to new conclusions. Let us state his conclusions briefly.

In the year 537 B.C. Sheshbazzar, a Babylonian Jew of Davidic descent, was sent to Jerusalem by Cyrus, in accordance with his conciliatory policy, as governor of Judæa. He was accompanied by a suite, in which was certainly his nephew Zerubbabel, and very possibly the 'heads' of Jewish families, as reported in the famous list. Joshua was one of these 'heads,' and became the first high priest in the post-exilic sense. As the 'heads' would be accompanied with their families and dependants, they formed altogether a considerable party. But they were not numerous enough, or they were not influential enough, to affect the tone of society already in Judæa. And when, under the instigation of Haggai and Zechariah, the temple was rebuilt, the work was done, mostly, at anyrate, by the inhabitants of

Judæa who had not been carried captive, not by returned exiles.

In 520 B.C. Sheshbazzar was succeeded by his nephew Zerubbabel. The temple was completed in 516. From that moment should be dated the end of the Exile and the beginning of the post-exilic age. For the true Exile was not the deportation of the people, but the departure of Jehovah from the Land of Promise. Jehovah departed when the temple fell. When the temple was restored He returned again. 'At any moment after the coping had been laid the King of Glory might be expected to come in.' Hence it was the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, the real builders of the second temple, who were also the real instruments in bringing the Captivity to an end.

Meantime there was trouble in Babylon. Usurpers had seized the throne of Nebuchadrezzar, and the central government was weak. It was then that Haggai and Zechariah conceived the daring project of anointing Zerubbabel king. Four Jews, probably the leaders of a party, arrived at Jerusalem with gifts of silver and gold from the wealthy Babylonian settlements. The treasure was converted, in accordance with a Divine direction, into a crown for Zerubbabel. This, as a historical fact, is of course new, but Professor Cheyne tells us how he came by it. We know that Zerubbabel was of the house of David; we know also that he had already received the Messianic name Branch or Sprout, a name coined perhaps by Jeremiah; all that remained then was to anoint him and announce his accession to the people. Now in Zec 6^{9-12} we are told that the prophet was commanded to take the silver and gold from the men who had come from Babylon and 'make crowns, and set them upon the head of Joshua, the son of Jehozadak, the high priest.' Professor Cheyne believes that the name *Joshua* is a mistake. 'It is not improbable that a later editor, who did not comprehend the passage and wished to suggest a possible historical reference, has put the name of Joshua instead of Zerubbabel into the text.' In this movement, however, Zechariah was disappointed. Things righted themselves in Babylon. Tatnai, the satrap of Syria, came and gave trouble in Jerusalem. Zerubbabel disappeared. And 'the golden crown was no doubt melted down and converted into some needed ornament for the temple.'

The Jews who were living in Babylon had not forgotten Jerusalem all this while. The author of the first appendix to the Second Isaiah's prophecy (chapters 49–55) was endeavouring to stimulate them to a personal co-operation with the Judæan reformers, and the *élite* of their body were devoting themselves to the difficult task of bringing the traditional Jewish laws up to date. But their practical interest was not felt in Jerusalem until a Judæan Israelite, named Hanani, conceived the idea of travelling to Susa, the winter residence of the Persian kings, and induced Nehemiah to return with him to Jerusalem. This was after the Syrian revolt of 448 B.C. under Megabyzos, which the Jews probably kept clear of, and so were in favour with Artaxerxes, the king. It is certain, at anyrate, that Nehemiah arrived in Jerusalem with firman and military escort, and at once set about his special mission, the repairing of the city walls.

Now the particular object of enmity to the Jews who were living in Babylon was the Samaritans. The Jews in Judæa itself could have borne with the Samaritans very well. 'The Samaritans were doubtless,' says Professor Cheyne, 'farther off from legal orthodoxy than the Jews, but the standard of orthodoxy even among the Jews cannot have been very high, especially in the country districts, where, in the absence of a strong central authority, gross superstitions still lingered. Nor is there any reason to think that the Samaritans ever gave up their interest in the great sanctuary of Judæa until they were forced.' They were forced to give it up by Nehemiah.

Professor Cheyne does not blame Nehemiah for that. He remembers that 'the religious isolation of the Jews on a strictly legal basis was an object of vital importance to the higher religion.' And he does not deeply sympathize with the Samaritans. For he finds it recorded that the orthodox Jews had already attempted to convert them and had failed. The record is in Is $65^{1.2}$. 'I offered admission' (this is Professor Cheyne's translation) 'to those who asked not after me; I offered my oracles to those who sought me not; I said, Here am I, here am I, to a class of men which called not upon my name. I have spread out my hands all the day to an unruly and disobedient people, who followed the way which is not good, after their own devices.'

There were faults, Professor Cheyne thinks, on both sides. The Jews were deficient in suavity, like Augustine of Canterbury when he tried in vain to unite the English and the Welsh in one Christian Church; the Samaritans, on their side, had as yet no religious receptivity. But what he finds most strange is that the same writer (probably) who thus spoke so harshly of the Samaritans for refusing to adopt the Jewish law, afterwards censured them for wishing to build a central sanctuary of their own. And it is the more extraordinary that he does so in words which logically would destroy also the temple at Jerusalem: 'Thus saith Jehovah, Heaven is my throne and earth my footstool. What house would ye build for me, and what place is my habitation? For all this has my hand made, and mine is all this, saith Jehovah' (Is $66^{1.2}$).

The enmity was increasing. Even before the arrival of Nehemiah, orthodox Jews in Judæa were sufficiently opposed to the Samaritans to use very strong language about their religious customs and to put their feelings into song. For Professor Cheyne believes that it was at this moment that Ps 16^{1-5} was composed. The speaker is 'the personified association of pious Israelites.' The Samaritans are they of whom he says, 'Their libations of blood I will not pour out; their (deity's) names I will not take on my lips.' Nehemiah's arrival strengthened this orthodox party in Jerusalem. Sanballat and Tobiah were driven into open hostility. It was Nehemiah that made the first official declaration of war.

The rest of the acts of Nehemiah are not recorded. Nor do we know the name and the religious tendency of the Tirshatha who succeeded him. If his successor was willing he was not able to cope with the aristocratic Jews who favoured an alliance with the Samaritans. The orthodox parties in Babylon were scandalized at the state of religious indifference into which Palestine fell, and Ezra, the scribe, was sent with a strong band to Jerusalem. It is the first great certain return of Jewish exiles to Palestine.

What Ezra did in Jerusalem we shall never know. For the account transmitted by the Chronicler in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah will not stand the tests of historical criticism. In particular, the story of the marriage reforms in Ezra 9, 10 is full of improbability. 'Such a delicate matter,' says Canon Cheyne, 'as the alteration of marriage customs cannot have been brought about so quickly and in such a rough and ready way. That the sight of Ezra, sitting with dishevelled hair in a stupor, and then the hearing of a solemn liturgical prayer, should have so unnerved the people who had married non-Jewish wives that they straightway volunteered to turn away their wives and their children, and that three days afterwards a still larger assembly should have gathered in cold, rainy weather in the open air, and sanctioned the appointment of a commission to compel the offenders to carry out this resolution, is surely incredible.'

Professor Cheyne does not take up this attitude out of consideration for Ezra. On the contrary, he thinks that Ezra was really much to blame. He was at first far too vehement in his language and vigorous in his demands. And he expresses a

fear 'that some too pliant persons may have given way to him.' If that is so, then, says Professor Cheyne, Ezra was guilty of a distinct denial of the Divine fatherhood—a doctrine expressed in the very first chapter of the narrative which introduces his Law-book. He feels bound to denounce this as much as he admires the very different attitude of the Apostle Paul. Nor can he forget the blessings which accrued to the English race through the union of a heathen king of Kent with a Christian princess from France. It is this recollection that compels him to 'shrink with horror' from the conduct of Ezra.

On the other hand, there were extenuating circumstances. It is by the religion of its mother that a child is influenced. Now the religion of the Samaritan mothers was local and unprogressive, being based on ancient custom; whereas the religion of Ezra was a book-religion, which to a considerable extent recognized the claims of development. His vehemence and rigour were therefore but the excess of his religious patriotism. And besides, the men who had these foreign wives had turned away the Jewish wives of their youth in order to marry them. And the prophet 'Malachi' mentions the sad divisions in families which had then taken place. Malachi feels himself unfit, indeed, to reform the abuse, and he (or some not much later writer) has added this appendix to his prophecy: 'Behold, I send you the prophet Elijah before Jehovah's great and terrible day come. He shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the land with a curse' (Mal $4^{5.6}$).

Ezra failed in the matter of the mixed marriages, and his failure called Nehemiah a second time from Susa to Jerusalem. Nehemiah succeeded where Ezra failed. He succeeded because he had the royal authority, and because of his great personal qualities. In short, this was the work for which Nehemiah was fitted. Ezra was fitted for other work than this. And now Professor Cheyne, who fears that he may seem to have underrated Ezra, represents him as the author of two grand achievements. In the first place, it was he and the Jews who came from Babylon with him that regarded themselves as the true Israelites; formed themselves into a national assembly—the ideas of the Church and the nation being henceforth inseparably fused together; became known as the 'Zion' of the later chapters of Isaiah, the 'poor' and 'needy' of the later Psalms, and the beginning of the great Jewish Church. In the second place, he was the author or at least the editor of the Law-book which formed the chief portion of the Priestly Code. And it is the possession of a written religious Law that has enabled the Jewish community to survive the centuries of persecution. Therefore, as the compiler or one of the compilers of that Law, Ezra is greater than the founder of an empire.

Professor Cheyne does not deny that this is a reconstruction of history. 'It is so,' he says, 'and it ought to be so. That the right moment for such an attempt has arrived, no one who knows the course of recent criticism can deny, and historical students will, I believe, recognize that the results here given have considerable probability.'

The second volume of the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE is making steady progress, and should be ready in the Spring. It will contain a larger proportion of important articles than any other volume is likely to contain. The following fall within its scope:—'Food,' by Professor Macalister; 'Galatia,' by Professor Ramsay; 'God,' by Professors A. B. Davidson and W. Sanday; 'Gospels,' by Professor Stanton; 'Hebrews,' by Professor Bruce; 'Holy Spirit,' by Professor Swete; 'Incarnation,' by Principal Ottley; 'Isaiah,' by Professor Smith; 'Israel,' by Professor Ryle; 'Jacob,' by Professor Driver; 'Jerusalem,' by Lieut.-Col. Conder; 'Jesus Christ,' by Professor Sanday.

R. W. Dale.

By the Rev. W. Johnston, B.D., Glasgow.

During his lifetime Dale was a riddle to many, and some must have thought him a mere bundle of paradoxes. Was he not a High Churchman and a secularist, a friend of the Revival and an ardent politician, an idealist and a man of affairs? Sympathetic onlookers discerned, indeed, from the first the essential unity, and it was becoming increasingly plain to others, but the admirable biography just published enables us for the first time adequately to comprehend the man, his work, and his thought.

Dale's was a singularly complete nature. There was intellectual force of a high order, strength of will, soundness of judgment, faculty for business. With all this there was a genuine religious interest, a capacity for understanding and realizing the things that are unseen and eternal. But from the *Life* we learn that to a far greater extent than one could have imagined possible, Dale was a man of feeling. If he argued and persuaded, planned and acted, he also loved and suffered. His soul thrilled at the touch of truth and circumstance and life. A letter from Mr. James, before he went to assist him, moved him to irrepressible tears. The death of his little Alice darkened his whole life. For years he could not trust himself to speak of her. The sudden death of his only brother absolutely crushed him. 'I have not,' he wrote, 'been disciplined to die, and a great part of all that I was seems to have died in him.' On the Sunday morning when the news came of the assassination of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, his voice was so changed by horror, indignation, and grief, as to be scarcely recognizable. For his fair ideal of municipal life he felt a passionate enthusiasm, and the mere apprehension that it might be stained in the actual, wounded him like a dagger. And his spirit was as sensitive in the religious sphere. The scenes of the Holy Land roused in him an almost oppressive emotion. He never went into the pulpit on Easter morning without being thrilled by the thought that all Western Christendom was exulting in the resurrection of the Lord. His zeal for Christian work was the outcome, not of conscience, but of compassion. The truth he apprehended mastered him, possessed his imagination, stirred his feeling. Of the Epistle to the Ephesians he said, 'Some parts of it intoxicated me: whether I was in the body or out of the body I could hardly tell.' He felt more than his words could express. When it came to writing, the colour had faded and the glory was extinguished. Sometimes he was like a dumb man wanting to speak and knowing that he cannot. But feeling fluctuates, and he was always subject to fits of depression. They came without any definite cause, heavy and overwhelming. To him it seemed very wonderful that any man should have an unbroken vision of God. But though the feeling was not constant, it was none the less real on that account. It was, indeed, upon this spiritual experience that the whole structure of his faith and thought rested. He was absolutely sincere. His nature was not sophisticated. Feeling had fair play. Truth and fact passed into feeling and life, life and feeling into truth. Unless we keep this ever in view there will be much in the man we shall never understand. Dale began with an Evangelical religion, but his mind was singularly open, both to the ideas of other times and lands, and to the currents of thought that influenced his own day. And so it came to pass that Secularism, Broad Churchism, and High Churchism all influenced him. The claims of this world, the claims of mind, the claims of Christian fellowship in turn laid hold of him.

He had imaginatively reproduced the old Evangelical thought and experienced the old feeling. For him, too, it was absolutely real. He had met God in Christ and been redeemed. The religious life was actual, wonderful, unique. But this justified no neglect or depreciation of what did not lie within the circle of the religious experience. God who was so real there could not be a shadow elsewhere. Christ who was so near there could not have vanished yonder. Duty was not duty if a man could escape it at will; God was not God if He were not everywhere; Jesus was not Lord if over a great part of the world He exercised no authority. God must be present outside our religious experience; He must have other institu-

tions than the Church. If we trust our spiritual experience, we must trust our experience altogether. We must be loyal to our whole nature and to both worlds. And so the secular claimed its own, and the nation was recognized as of God, and citizenship was declared to have its duties. Dale believed that the nation, like the family, was a Divine institution, and that it had come into being, not by any human contract, nor by chance, but by the will of God and for the development and discipline of character. Nothing in the United States displeased him more than the way in which honest men neglected their citizen duties. 'The rogues,' he said, 'do public work in order to make money, and the honest men neglect public work in order to save money. Judged by the laws of public morality, there is not much to choose between them.' The failure to assert Christ's authority in any sphere was criminal, and must be retrieved. All work was sacred in which a man could do the will of God, and God's thought and purpose were as wide as life itself. To look after the soul was too great a task for any man, and if he laid the burden of it on himself he would be able to do no work for God. Once when Dale was asked when he meant to quit politics and look after his soul, he replied that he had given his soul to Christ to look after. 'He can do it better than I can: my duty is to do His will and to leave the rest to Him.' And that answer breathed the very spirit of the Master's teaching.

But Broad-Churchism, too, laid its hand on Dale, and in very much the same way gained an influence over him. His spiritual experience, because he trusted it so fully, drew him outside the religious circle in which it had begun. He became conscious of the communion of the saints. He recognized the voice of the Christian soul in quarters he had deemed alien and outcast. He found men whose creed was small, living a Christian life, giving when challenged the password known only to the soldiers of the Lord. He was too honest to deny this, and his sense of the reality of the experience that had been his helped him to see its independence of much that had seemed to support it. So Science and Criticism might have their say, and no one need fear them. All this was reinforced by the intellectual bent of his own nature, by his desire to understand and to follow the truth. He would not suppress any part of himself, he would be loyal to the full revelation of God. And it was along these lines that the Broad Church movement influenced him. He was the friend of his neighbour the Unitarian Dr. Crosskey. He was willing to admit Unitarians to the membership of the Church. There might be saving faith where the divinity of Jesus was denied, and men had no right to exclude from the Church any who were in Christ. 'The Christian society which imposes any other condition of membership than faith in Christ is a sect, and not, in the highest sense of the term, a Christian Church. It is a private Christian club, it receives persons into membership, not because they are brethren of Christ, but because they are the brethren of Christ professing certain religious opinions or observing certain religious practices. It is a society not for all Christians, but for a particular description of Christians. It is a sect—not a Church.' Dale admitted that he held what many would call a Broad Church theology, but he preferred to call it Deep. His sympathies were with Maurice rather than with Stanley. The latter he never understood, and though he made repeated attempts to get the better of his antipathy he never succeeded. With Maurice, on the contrary, he found himself in growing agreement, and we can see plain traces of his influence, echoes even of his phrases.

But Dale's spiritual experience led his thoughts in yet another direction. From the right as well as from the left there came voices that awakened sympathetic response in his own heart. Here, indeed, he found his deepest affinity. He was himself a High Churchman of a sort. High-Churchism has four aspects, or elements: a spiritual, an ecclesiastical-political, a ritualistic-æsthetic, and a materialistic-miraculous. These elements are kindred and yet alien. Dale's strong common sense, his refusal to shut his eyes to plain facts, his respect for intellect, would have saved him in any case from being influenced by the last. But he saw also how remote it was from such a spiritual experience as that in which he and the High Churchmen alike rested. The doctrine that in Baptism a child receives supernatural grace and is made a member of Christ he counted a pernicious superstition. Children who died young, whether baptized or not, lived with God. It was not in this fashion that God laid hold of a human life and made it His own.

Neither was Dale prepared to exclude a man from membership because he did not take part in the celebration of the Supper. A man might refuse as a matter of conscience to take part in either sacrament and yet have a clear claim to a place in the august society of saints. Dale's loyalty to the idea of the State, his regard for citizenship and for the world, his sense of the need and right of civil government, kept him from that type of thought which seeks to found an *imperium in imperio*, and may even menace the well-being of the republic. His strong sense of the meaning of the spiritual experience helped him here. If Christ was with every little company they could manage their own affairs without any elaborate polity. For what was practical in this connexion he had the most supreme disdain. 'Give me a Church polity which is what men call practical—a polity which in its completeness can be realized—and I am sure that it is something different from the ideal polity of that Divine society whose Builder and Maker is God.' The Divine Presence was the one essential condition for the being of a Church. *Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia.* For Dale the idea of the Church implied no federation of individual congregations. The unity was purely spiritual, and no power could arise covering the whole country and rivalling the State. Of any such rivalry he was intensely jealous. Just because religion was so sacred and the mission of the Church so high, the Divine society should not meddle with politics. The dominion of the Church over the State was perilous to both. It was as citizens and not as church members that Christian men must achieve their political tasks. Neither was Dale attracted by the ritualistic or æsthetic aspect of the High Church movement. The very importance he attached to feeling in religion made him dread this. Religious feeling was the outcome of contact with Divine truth, with the very life of God, but in its general character it did not greatly differ from feeling of an entirely different origin. To be stirred by the presence of God, to be awed by the majesty Divine, to be soothed by the comfort of an actual redemption, was one thing; to be influenced by fine music and gorgeous vestments and lofty cathedrals was quite another. Such spurious emotions were only too easily aroused, and might prevent the true religious feeling from ever coming into being. There remains the spiritual element in High-Churchism, and it is this that we find in Dale. He had a high sense of the distinctive mission of the Church, its supernatural origin and history, its majestic autonomy. This lay behind his Disestablishment endeavours. The Church should be free: it needed no other guidance than that of its own spiritual Head. There was in the Church a true Divine Presence. Among all who shared this there was, and ought to be more fully, a union and communion of saints. Religious fellowship between Christians of different Churches was not merely a pleasant luxury but an important aid to religious knowledge and spiritual growth. Dale felt the spell of Newman, and for Pusey he had a great admiration. When he finished the first two volumes of Pusey's *Life* he 'closed the book with a deep impression of the nobleness and massiveness of his nature, and feeling more than ever that the power of God was in him.' A manual of intercessory prayer compiled by one of the Cowley Fathers he made use of in his private devotions. It was in his doctrine of the Supper that Dale made his most obvious, though not perhaps his closest, affiliation with the High Churchmen. When we come to the Lord's table, we come, he declared, not to give but to receive. 'The act of Christ when He places these elements in our hands is a spiritual reality. It represents a real transfer of power.' In the Eucharist Christ communicated to the Church the eternal life that is in Him. But the sacraments might be dispensed by any member of the Church, for they belonged to the Church and not to a priesthood.

And just as Dale thus summed up in himself the movements of the time, so he sympathetically appreciated very diverse elements of the past. The Greek and the Latin elements in the Church doctrine both had a hold of him, the one on the metaphysical side and the other on the practical and the political. They were fused together by his sense of sin and his mysticism rather than by any very rigorous intellectual synthesis, much as they had been in the Church itself. He began from the Latin side, from the Atonement, which had been the first thing with the Evangelicals, and he worked back to the Incarnation, where his intellectual interests chiefly lay. But the deepest elements in his conception of God were not

derived so much from his doctrine of the Person of Christ as from his experience of the life and work of Jesus, and from that consciousness in good men which had been made possible by the Christ living and abiding in their hearts. 'A great sorrow brings with it wonderful discoveries of the tenderness, depth, and constancy of human affection, and therefore of the infinite love of God; for man is the image of God, and all that is most gracious in man reveals God.' 'The children cannot be better than the Father.' 'God Himself could not be our Consoler unless in a very real and deep sense the sorrows of the creation caused Him grief.' All our personal affections are but parables of Divine things. But from the idea of God thus gained Dale never thoroughly worked back to the conception of the Atonement. No one, indeed, understood better the difference between experience and speculation, but probably few would draw the line quite where he did. Experience does verify all that entered into his essential belief, but not quite all the speculation with which it had come to be associated in his mind. He began at the Calvinistic standpoint, and though he often assailed it he never really abandoned it, and as he grew older he became more conscious of his real affinity with it. His conception of Justification answered exactly to Calvin's, and one fancies there are even echoes of Calvin's words. He was not a Calvinist if by that we mean one who held all the points of a fully-developed Calvinism, but he was a Calvinist in as far as he clung firmly to those great thoughts that lie behind the system and give it its power. His genuine religious experience, as all such experience must, inevitably took this form. He was an Arminian in as far as Arminianism was the protest of common sense against the exaggeration of Calvinistic principles. If we were to describe him in the most modern way we should say that there were many elements of Ritschlianism in him. The reaction from individualism, the distrust of Natural Theology, the vision of God in Christ, the refusal to rest faith on anything else than revelation, the rooting of theology in life, the practical social interest, the frank acceptance of science and criticism, all these marks of the school find a place in him. The strain of mysticism affiliates him with Herrmann rather than with Ritschl himself. But he is divided from the Ritschlians by his metaphysical tendencies.

In Ethics Dale felt the charm of the Catholic ideal, and he thought the beauty of Newman's vision of the saintly life enough to tempt the angels from their thrones. Yet he could not yield to that ideal. It was in the air, touching earth too lightly and missing heaven. Its fascination was of a kind not to be found in the four Gospels. Of the larger ethics we call politics he had a master's knowledge, and never does he impress us more with his intellectual resource and practical sagacity than when dealing with the questions that arise in that sphere. Although a staunch Liberal he was never a strong party man, and he was always guided by ethical and religious considerations. His Liberalism was of the new and imperialistic type. He believed in peace 'at any price, even at the price of war.' He had a lofty idea of our imperial mission, and thought that peremptory and forcible intervention in the affairs of a foreign state might be abundantly justified. 'With nations, as with individuals, the power to confer a benefit or to avert an injury is inseparably associated with the duty of using it.' He welcomed any extension of imperial territory where our rule might establish order and justice in the place of strife and iniquity. He was willing to extend largely the limits within which the collective action of the State should replace individual enterprise. The object, he believed, of all social and political speculation was to discover how the life of the working man might be made happier. As regarded the individual ethic he never ceased to lay the greatest stress upon the importance of conduct. But as he grew older he felt more and more the difficulty of keeping in the right path. Duty was not less imperative than before, but even in its plainest guise it was harder than he had thought, and grace was more wonderful and more welcome. Character was always more than truth, but it was not easy to gain or keep. 'The ice cracks in such unexpected places—the ship is so apt to strike on rocks when the chart gave no warning of them—that mere safety seems to me a much greater reason for thankfulness than it used to be. To do some great thing is the craving of early ambition: to do quiet duty honestly and without serious falls satisfies the heart when youth disappears.' So he wrote at fifty. Twelve years

later he declared that as he grew older he thought more and more of the perils of living. To a friend he wrote: 'What thankfulness ought you and I to have . . . that we have been brought thus far without wreck. . . . Merely to have been kept from ruin seems to me so great a thing.' There indeed we have a note of the very ethic of Jesus.

At the basis of Dale's own character there lay a passionate ethical strenuousness and an exalted religious faith. This was his inheritance from the heroic days of Congregationalism. For these days were not yet remote when he was young. He had talked with men who had been driven from their homes, and had faced the danger of being stoned or beaten for conscience' sake. He had preached in chapels that were meanly built and obscure in situation, because those who built them might have to meet the ban of the magistrate or the fury of the mob. Dale's imagination was kindled, his heart fired. Duty was lord. His own most cherished ideals he repeatedly set aside when they seemed to him to clash with what he ought plainly to do. Yet he was no ascetic, and he could not be called an austere man. He had a pleasant humour and loved the world. The traditional conception of Puritanism he thought incorrect. The later evangelical idea of worldliness he did not think had had any hold on the Puritans in their best days. He never presumed on his great position. He was patient and conciliatory, willing to wait for years even in matters about which he greatly cared. The modesty with which he entered upon his ministry was as beautiful as the self-criticism with which it closed was pathetic. When in 1891 he came back to his people after a long and serious illness these were his words: 'During these months of silence I have seen with humiliation and pain how great have been the defects of my past ministry; and while I thank God for the long-suffering and for the great mercy that he has shown to me in permitting me to stand once more in this place . . . I tremble lest I should again be unfaithful. . . . I ask you, as my life has been prolonged in answer to your prayers, to entreat God to defend me from sin and from making shipwreck of faith, so that neither you nor I may have reason to regret that when I had come so near to the happy shores, and was just coming into the harbour, I was brought back to the stormy and perilous seas of this present life; entreat Him so to enrich me with His grace that in my personal life I may be more humble, more tender, more gentle, more upright, more unselfish, more devout.' Yet few men had less need to make such a request. More than most he had escaped the dangers which beset a man in his position. He had no jealousy of another's success, and gave ungrudging expression to his appreciation. He was equally loyal and affectionate to the old man whom he served in his youth, and the young man who helped him when he grew old. He never sacrificed the interests of new congregations and new districts to his own, but sent away members whom he loved and honoured when he thought they could serve God better elsewhere. His kindred and his friends he loved with all his heart, and he was never afraid of expecting too much from earthly affection. Behind all lay his love to God, his passion for Jesus Christ in whom he had seen the Father. A great character, Christian to the core, and essentially Protestant in type. While he lived his influence was in a measure lessened by our differences in Church and State. Now that he has gone and there remains only his work and the fair record of his life, Christian men everywhere will recognize how brave and true was the comrade now serving in the unconquerable army, and since he has passed whither the sound of our strife is hushed he will take his place among the teachers of the holy Catholic Church, and in his words men will find the light and peace of the life eternal.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

As already intimated, the subjects of study for the session 1898–99 are the First Book of Psalms (Psalms i.–xli.) and the First Epistle of St. Peter.

Those who desire to study one or both of these portions of Scripture between November 1898 and June 1899 are invited to send their name and address to the Editor of The Expository Times. There is no fee or other obligation. The purpose of the Guild is to encourage systematic study of Holy Scripture as distinguished from the mere reading of it, and the conditions are made as simple as possible. The best commentary available should be used. There are excellent editions of both books in the 'Cambridge Bible for Colleges.' And if the member can study the Hebrew and Greek, he will know that Delitzsch's (Hodder & Stoughton) or Cheyne's *Psalms* (Kegan Paul) are scholarly and suggestive, while an edition of a portion of St. Peter by the late Professor Hort has just been published by Messrs. Macmillan.

Students are invited to send short papers as the result of their study, and the best of these papers will be published, one at least every month if found suitable. And the writers of those papers that are accepted will be asked at the end of the year to select a volume out of a list which Messrs. T. & T. Clark will furnish.

New Members.

Rev. Frank Holmes, Withernsea, near Hull.
Rev. James Vivian Rogerson, The Manse, Gladstone Place, Hanley, Staffs.
Rev. A. W. Woolverton, Curate, 17 Sylvan Grove, Old Kent Road, London, S.E.
Rev. Samuel P. Warren, Rector of Balbriggan, Co. Dublin.
Rev. Robert A. Stewart, The Manse, Aldershot, Hants.
Rev. J. A. Wilson, Isleham, Cambs.
Rev. John E. Christie, Congregational Manse, Darvel, Ayrshire.
Rev. Samuel Curne, The Manse, Clones, Ireland.
Mr. William Evans, Court House, St. Clears, Carmarthenshire.
Rev. Avery A. Shaw, Windsor Baptist Church, Nova Scotia.
Rev. T. Lionel Brooke, B.A., Curate of St. Mark's, Southampton.
Rev. Dundas L. Erskine, M.A., Somerville, Tsolo, South Africa.
Mr. G. Castle, 8 Bath Terrace, Bicester, Oxon.
Mr. Thomas Ellis, 110 Ingleby Drive, Dennistoun, Glasgow.
Rev. John Kellas, Manse of Rathen, Lonmay.

The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual.

By Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Aberdeen.

XI. Propitiation and Expiation.

When the punishment has been inflicted the sufferer propitiates the god or goddess (εἱλασάμεν(οι) Μητέραν Ἀνάειτιν, ἱλασάμενος καὶ εὐχαριστῶν, εἱλάσετο τὸν θεόν, εἱλασαμένη εὐλογεῖ Μητρί). This verb is rare in the New Testament, and much more frequent in the Old. The thought which lies in it, according to its ordinary sense, was too material for the spirit of Christianity. The process of propitiating the god is described in one case, in which the guilty person had offended by eating the sacred flesh of the goat; 'by purifications and sacrifices, I propitiated the Lord' (καθαρμοῖς καὶ θυσίαις ε[ἱλασάμην τὸν Κ]ύριον). Some kind of gift or offering may be understood as the means of propitiation in every case; the public statement and confession on a *stêlê* was apparently a sufficient acknowledgment and propitiation; in others, the inscription and confession were engraved on the basis supporting the gift dedicated to the god. Thus the favour of the god was bought with a gift; and it may be in order to avoid this suggestion that the word is rather avoided in the New Testament. It occurs in Lk 18^{13}, where the publican says, 'May God be propitiated towards me, the sinner'

(ὁ Θεὸς ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ), and in He 2^{17}, 'To make propitiation for the sins of the people' (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ).[1]

In making propitiation for the Christian's sins, Christ himself is the propitiatory gift; and hence He is called the ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν in 1 Jn 2^{2} 4^{10}, and ἱλαστήριον in Ro 3^{25}.[2] To the Christians Christ is the only propitiatory offering to purify their sins. These terms require a note. ἱλασμός, formed like καθαρμός, is not found in the inscriptions, but is used several times by Plutarch, *e.g. Solon*, 12, ἱλασμοῖς τισι καὶ καθαρμοῖς καὶ ἱδρύσεσι; both καθαρμός (found in *C.B.*, No. 42), and ἱλασμός are rather too literary in type to be common in inscriptions. ἱλαστήριον is more the type of word likely to be used in the epigraphic style. Just as the monument of dedication and thanksgiving to the god is called εὐχαριστήριον (see sec. iii.),[3] so we might expect that the actual offering by which the god is propitiated should be called ἱλαστήριον. The word, though not as yet found in the hieratic documents, occurs as the supposed inscription on an offering dedicated to Athena of Ilium as a propitiation by the Greeks at Troy (ἱλαστήριον Ἀχαιοὶ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ Ἰλιάδι). Dio Chrysostom, who describes this supposed offering in his speech to the people of Ilium (xi. 121; *Arn.* i. p. 146) was accustomed to the hieratic language of Asia Minor, his own country; and we cannot doubt that he uses for this imaginary dedication a form of words with which his hearers were familiar. We may, therefore, confidently expect that, when discoveries increase, this word will be found actually engraved on the basis of a dedication.

Again, a sacrifice or gift dedicated to bring salvation, or to give thanks for salvation, is called σωτήριον; thus *Herodian* iv. 4, on the death of Geta, Caracalla, προσκυνεῖται ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν ἐς γῆν ὡμολόγει τε χαριστήρια ἔθυέ τε σωτήρια; here all the terms are technical hieratic terms (ὁμολογέω, χαριστήριον, προσκυνοῦμαι), and so also must σωτήριον be. It is in this sense that σωτήριον is used in Lk 2^{30} 3^{6}, Ac 28^{28}, Eph 6^{17}; it is not a mere variation of σωτηρία (according to the Authorized and Revised Versions), but the thing that produces σωτηρία.

On these grounds we must conclude that ἱλαστήριον was a technical term, indicating the offering or dedication by which expiation is attained, *i.e.* among the Christians Christ.

Similarly, as the verb λύω was used in the sense of expiating one's faults, so λύτρον was the sacrifice whereby the expiation was effected (sec. viii. p. 6); and to the Christians Christ was the λύτρον (Mt 20^{28}, Mk 10^{42}).

The process of cure after the god was propitiated is hardly ever referred to in the class of inscriptions here discussed; the interest of the *hieron* was not primarily medical, as at the temple of Asklepios at Epidauros. Only in one case, Charite, having met with an accident, was treated with incantations by the priestess, and paid her vow (περίπτωμα σχοῦσα καὶ ἐξᾳσθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς ἱερείας εὐχήν, *Athen. Mittheil.*, 1887, p. 254). In this case Charite's illness was not understood by her to be a chastisement. She had an accident; she vowed a gift if she were cured; the priestess cured her by chanting hieratic formulæ over her; she paid her vow. This sense of ἐξᾳδω is not elsewhere found, and the aorist passive is unknown; but the meaning seems certain, as Professor J. H. Wright points out. The verb elsewhere means to charm away a spell, to disenchant.

XII. The Confession.

The confession of the sin is in the pagan inscriptions expressed by ὁμολογέω, or, more commonly, ἐξομολογέομαι.[4] These are characteristic Christian words. An interesting case occurs in Ac 19^{18}, where many of the new Ephesian converts came 'confessing and declaring their deeds' (ἐξομολογούμενοι καὶ ἀναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν). Their action seems to be exactly what they had been accustomed to regard as the proper procedure in their pagan belief; they confessed their wrong actions (πράξεις used in a bad sense here) and made proclamation of them, probably in the way of warning to others. 'Confessing their sins' (ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας) is a typical Christian phrase; and public confession is urged by James (5^{16}) as a duty on all (ἐξομολογεῖσθε

[1] Deissmann points out (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 52) that the only other parallel that occurs to this use of ἱλάσκεσθαι ἁμαρτίας is in the inscriptions of Xanthos.

[2] The analogies quoted seem to show that ἱλαστήριον is noun, not adjective, in this place; though some distinguished scholars prefer to make it an adjective.

[3] χαριστήριον is very common in epigraphy.

[4] ἐξομολογέω (Lk 22^{6}) has a different sense, 'he consented.' ὁμολογέω has usually the sense of acknowledging something honourable; but ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας (1 Jn 1^{9}).

ἀλλήλοις τὰς ἁμαρτίας), precisely as it was often demanded by the gods. The idea that a guilty person was 'sent (to the temple) to make confession' (πενφθεὶς[εἰς ὁμο]λο[γ]ίαν), occurs in *C.B.*, No. 51 (where the restoration has high probability, but is not certain); similarly, in He 3[1], Christ is ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν.

Some of the Cnidian formulæ of execration are instructive as to the importance attached to confession. Thus in one case 'may Antigone go up to (the shrine of) Demeter, consumed with the fire (of fever) and confessing her sin': *i.e.* may punishment be sent on her by the goddess, and force her to go to the temple, and confess her sin, and seek forgiveness: ἀναβᾶι Ἀντιγόνη πὰ(ρ)Δάματρα πεπρημένα ἐξομολ{ογ}ου[μέν]α:[1] the term 'go up' is regularly used of going to the temple in the hieratic inscriptions of Asia Minor. Another example is, 'may he bring to Demeter (the things which he has stolen, clothes, etc.), he himself and any other that has my property, consumed with fever and confessing his sin.' It is characteristic of the way in which the Greeks tended to turn solemn religious ideas into a commonplace or a jest, that these formulas of execration seem to be at Cnidos often little more than advertisements of lost property.

XIII. The Announcement and Warning.

In the inscriptions of Dionysopolis the conclusion of the whole matter is a public confession and announcement engraved on a *stêlê*, either as a warning that he who sins will have the *stêlê* and its inscription as an example (ἕξει τὴν στήλην ἐξεμπλάριον), or as an order and command not to despise the god (παραγγέλλω πᾶσι μὴ καταφρονεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ). This use of παραγγέλλω is very common in Luke and Paul; *e.g.* 1 Ti 6[17], τοῖς πλουσίοις παράγγελλε μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν. The use of ἐξεμπλάριον cannot be paralled from the Bible; but it occurs in Ignatius in the first quarter of the second century (see Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, i. p. 296, ii. p. 34), and its employment there has been actually turned into an argument that the Epistles attributed to Ignatius must be late, for this use of the Latin word in Greek could not be early. The Roman legal term *exemplar* became familiar to the natives, and was probably adopted in the temple formulæ as early as the first century, though the three inscriptions, *C.B.*, 46–48, which contain it, cannot well be earlier than the second century, and might possibly be as late as the third.

The use of καταφρονεῖν in the New Testament is common, but does not offer any close parallel to the epigraphic phrase 'despise the god.'

In the Katakekaumene the facts are much the same, but the formulæ are different. An inscribed *stêlê* is erected at the temple (ἔγγραφον ἔστησαν, or [ἔγρα]ψα καὶ ἀνέσ[τησα τὴν] στήλην),[2] or an altar with inscription is erected (ἀνέστησαν τὸν βωμόν, ἀνέθηκαν τὸν βωμόν).

In the Katakekaumene the worshipper often ends by blessing the god (sec. iv.); and hence the *stêlê*, which bears the inscription, is called 'a blessing' in one case, ἀνέθηκα εὐλογίαν ὅτι ἐγενόμην ὁλόκληρος (*C.B.*, No. 52).[3] By a similar figure the present of money, accompanied with a blessing, made by the Church of Corinth, is called their 'blessing' (2 Co 9[5], τὴν προκατηγγελμένην εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν).

In one case, 'bearing witness' is substituted for 'blessing' (see sec. xv.).

The *stêlê* is also called a dedication (ἱεροπο(ί)ημα); and the phrase is ποιεῖν τὸ ἱεροπο(ί)ημα. Like στήλη, this word does not occur in the New Testament, in which such testimonies would be wholly out of place.

XIV. The Command of God.

Probably the most characteristic and frequently recurring feature in the Anatolian votive inscriptions is the influence exercised by the Divine command. Slaves are set free (*C.B.*, No. 37, 39), dedications of statues are made (*C.B.*, No. 37), etc.

According to the command of the god, κατὰ τὴν ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ θεοῦ (or τῆς θεοῦ, or a special deity is named). This is the commonest phrase; 'and it

[1] So Dr. Wuensch ingeniously reads in No. 3536 (Bechtel, *Dialektuischr.*), except that he has the incorrect active voice ἐξομολ{ογ}οῦ[σ]α (against Newton and Bechtel). He fails to observe that the middle voice is regular in the compound verb; and hence restores in No. 3537 ἐξ[ομολογ]ῶν, where Sir C. Newton (followed by Bechtel) more correctly restores ἐξ[αγορεύ]ων, comparing Plutarch, *de Sup.* 168D ἐξαγορεύει τινὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ (a common Septuagint usage). But possibly the Cnidian writer of 3537 used bad Greek; and Wuensch's restoration might be thus possible.

[2] This inscription is not restored properly in *Smyrn. Mouseion*, No. τλγ'.

[3] It probably, but not certainly, belongs to the Dionysopolis district.

is a relic of the primitive purely theocratic form of government, when the life of the population round the central *hieron* was guided mainly by the will of the god declared through his priests or prophets' (*C.B.*, p. 134).

The Pauline phrases, κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ, or τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ, form an exact parallel to κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ Κυρίου Τυράννου Διός (le Bas-Wadd., No. 667), and many similar phrases. The word ἐπιταγή is not used in the Bible except in the letters of Paul.

In some cases the Divine command was given when the worshipper had voluntarily sought advice: 'I asked the god: I erected to the Mother of the gods a *stêlê*, blessing thy powers' (ἐρώτησα τὸν θεόν· ἀνέστησα Μητρὶ θεῶν στήλην ε(ὐ)λογῶν σου τὰς δυνάμ-(ε)ις). The expression here is elliptical, and evidently implies, 'The god demanded from me a *stêlê* for the Mother.' In many cases where the word is not used, it is probable that such a question was addressed to the god, and that the ἐπιταγὴ followed.

In sepulchral inscriptions the διατάσσομαι is quite a technical term in the inscriptions of South-Western Asia Minor (especially at Aphrodisias), in the sense of 'to give directions by will,' a sense which occurs sometimes in literature (Plutarch, *de lat. viv.* iii. p. 1129a; *Anth. Pal.* xi. 133, 3); and διαταγαί are the stipulations in the last will and testament engraved on the tombstone.[1] According to Judeich, these directions are called in one inscription (*C.I.G.*, 4300), θεῖαι διαταγαί; and in a Trallian inscription τὰ διατάγματα καὶ οἱ πάτριοι νόμοι denote 'the testamentary directions on the tombstone and the old-standing laws of the country' (*Bull. Corresp. Hellén.* v., 1881, p. 344). διατάξεις is used in a similar sense.

[1] I quote almost *verbatim* from 'Judeich' in *Altertümer von Hierapolis*, by Humann, etc., 1898, p. 111.

No example which can be placed on a parallel with these seems to occur in the New Testament. But G. Hirschfeld,[2] following L. Ross, held that διατάσσομαι and the cognate nouns in all the above-mentioned class of inscriptions refer, not to the directions given in the will of the deceased, but to an ancient law of the country (οἱ πάτριοι νόμοι) re-enacted by the Roman emperors (θεῖαι διαταγαί); and διατάγματα is the regular translation of *mandata*, the instructions and charges given by the emperors to provincial governors. In this sense Luke and Paul frequently use διατάσσομαι, διατάσσω, διαταγή (twice), διάταγμα (He 11^{23} of the Egyptian king), for the law and instructions given by God or by Christ to all Christians (ὁ Κύριος διέταξεν, 1 Co 9^{14}; τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ διαταγῇ, Ro 13^{2}), or by Paul himself to his churches or to a subordinate official (1 Co 7^{17} 10^{34} 16^{1}, Ti 1^{5}).

In *C.B.*, No. 38, we find a foundling who was exposed in accordance with a vision (κατὰ ὄν[αρ ἐκτεθέντα], ὃν δ[ί]έθεψρεν Νεικηφόρ[ος]). The phrase, κατὰ ὄναρ, expressive of a revelation of the Divine will, occurs in Matthew, *e.g.* 2^{12}, χρηματισθέντες κατ' ὄναρ μὴ ἀνακάμψαι πρὸς Ἡρῴδην. This phrase was felt to be out of keeping with the character of Christian revelation, for it is used only in the first two chapters of Matthew, which partake more of the nature of popular tradition, and in the message of Pilate's wife (27^{19}). Elsewhere the word ὅραμα (ὅρασις and ἐνύπνιον much less characteristic) is substituted, which are not known in the religious language. Was ὄναρ felt to approximate too near to popular superstition, and the more general term ὅραμα substituted, even where a dream is clearly meant (as in Ac $16^{9.10}$ 18^{9})?

The demand which was in many cases made by the god (see sec. x.) was one of the forms in which his commands were expressed.

[2] *Königsberger Studien*, 1885, i., p. 121 f.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS iv. 7.

'If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door: and unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.'

EXPOSITION.

'If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?'—God seeks by private remonstrance to bring him to his senses concerning the danger which threatens him. The question (v.[6]) is put to him to direct his attention to his own heart, and to the roots there to be found of his distorted gestures. When man has once made room for evil within, there is but one step from inward to outward evil-doing; the sinful act crouches greedily like a beast of prey at the door of his heart till he should step out and fall a victim to it.—DELITZSCH.

'If thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door.'—Or '*sin is at the door* (cf. Pr 9[14]) *a lurker*.' Sin is compared to a ravenous beast lying in wait for its prey; perhaps a lion is here intended (cf. 1 P 5[8]). This is the ordinary explanation of the verse. It is possible, however, that the text is corrupt. The mention of the '*house door*' is strange, and the lion can hardly be described as lurking outside the door of a dwelling-place. Dillmann suggests an emendation by which 'sin' would be figuratively depicted as a woman who tempts or leads astray.—SPURRELL.

'Unto thee shall be his desire.'—The word translated desire is particularly appropriate to express the temptations by which sin entices and attacks the heart; it describes graphically the voluptuous delight with which the demon of allurement approaches human weakness and passion.—KALISCH.

'And thou shalt rule over him.'—Drive away and conquer the sin that is pressing thee by banishing ill-humour, and not allowing thyself to be hurried on to evil deeds.—KNOBEL.

IN the concluding words *him* refers to the croucher, by which figure sin, as impelling to its own incorporation in an outward act, is represented. We certainly expect that God should rather require of Cain that he should suppress the passion fermenting within him; but the ruling over sin demanded from him consists in keeping closed the door which still forms a barrier between the ill-feeling and the criminal act, and in thus struggling to keep down sinful thoughts lest he should be driven by them into crime. Moral self-control is so far possible to the natural man even since the fall.—DELITZSCH.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

What crouches at the Door?

By the Rev. Alexander Maclaren, D.D.

In the world's childhood God spoke to men as to children. There were no words then framed to express abstract conceptions. Men were taught by pictures. But childlike as they were, those early men had consciences, and they did understand one abstraction, and that was sin. They knew the difference between good and evil. God made it clear to Cain that his sacrifice was rejected because it was that of an evil-doer. The key to the meaning of the passage is to remember that it describes what happens after, and because of, wrong-doing. All depends on 'If thou doest not well.' *Then* 'sin lieth at the door.' The picture is of the wrong-doer's sin lying at his door like a crouching tiger ready to spring, and, if it springs, fatal. Then the words spoken to Eve are, by a bold metaphor, transferred to this relationship, and, in horrible parody of wedded union and love, we have the picture of the sin that was thought of as crouching at the sinner's door like a wild beast now wedded to him. It has a kind of tigerish, murderous desire after him, while he is to subdue and control it.

1. First think of the wild beast we tether to our doors by our wrong-doing. We talk of 'responsibility,' 'guilt,' and 'consequences that can never be effaced.' All these terms are implied in the metaphor. We are apt to think that when an evil deed is done it passes away and leaves no results. The lesson taught here is that every deed is immortal. Its guilt is on our heads. Its consequences have to be experienced by us. Your deed of a moment, forgotten as soon as done, lies there at your door. It is debited to your account, and stands inscribed against you for ever. Think how you would like it if all your deeds from your childhood, all your follies, your vices, your evil thoughts, impulses, and actions were made visible and embodied before you. They are there though you do not see them yet. One day you will find out that they are. For this is the law, 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' There is no seed which does not sprout in the harvest of the moral life. Every deed germinates according to its kind. We all have consciences. We all have memories. We all know how deeds long forgotten have an awful power of rising again after long years. Your memory has in it everything you ever did. You are writing your biography on

the fleshly tables of your heart, and one day it will all be spread out before you, and you will be bid to read it and say what you think of it. What an awful menagerie of unclean beasts some of us have at our doors! What sort of creatures have you at yours?

2. The longing of sin towards the sinner. A man is mated to his wickedness, and it has an unhallowed longing for him. Every evil done exercises a fascination over him which makes it easier to do it again. All sin has an awful power of perpetuating itself. As the prophet says of the doleful creatures in his vision, 'None of them shall want her mate.' 'None is barren among them.'

3. The command is also a promise, 'Thou shalt rule over it.' Cain knew what it was to war against the wild creatures and tame some of them for his use. And the Divine voice says, so rule over this wild beast that is threatening you. If men are not to be torn in pieces, they must master the animal that is in them. But can man do this? When the body can eliminate poison from its veins by its own energy. But what God commands God enables us to do. And the words point on through the ages to the fact that God's own Son came down from heaven, like an athlete into the arena, to fight with and overcome the grim wild beasts, our passions and our sins, and to lead them transformed in the silken leash of His love.

II.

By M. M. Kalisch, Phil. Doc.

1. It is evident that Cain's heart was no longer pure. It had a criminal propensity which made the acceptance of his offering impossible. Yet Cain was grateful to God. He brought Him of his produce as a mark of his gratitude. He valued His applause, and His displeasure cast a gloom over his soul. He must then have sinned against man, not God. Envy and jealousy had filled his heart when he contrasted his toilsome life with the pleasant existence of Abel. With incessant exertion and anxiety, dependent on the skies, he gained a scanty subsistence, whilst his brother enjoyed a life of security and abundance. And while he envied Abel's prosperity he despised his idleness. Hatred and jealousy took root in his heart. Joy at his own success was embittered by the aspect of his brother's greater affluence. How could God look with delight upon an offering which the offerer himself did not regard with unalloyed satisfaction? Is not jealousy a sign of a dissatisfied mind? Could, then, Cain's gratitude be pure and noble? The rejection of his offering was a proof of Cain's sinful disposition.

2. It was an admonition to banish low sentiments from his heart. One evil deed is always the parent of other and greater sins. It is difficult to arrest the power of wickedness. Envy ended in murder. The noxious root matured a poisonous fruit; moral disease finished with moral death. Sin has the irresistible propensity of attacking the heart of man, and an eternal warfare is roused in his bosom from the moment that sin first enters it. But every human heart encloses the seed of evil, so this struggle agitates every man. It is the principal task of his spiritual existence to conquer in these combats. Therefore God said to Cain, more in encouragement than in reproach, 'Thou shalt rule over it'; it was still in his power to obtain a triumph; if he could not destroy the enemy he could disarm him and prevent his progress.

Illustrations.

Acceptable Sacrifice.—We know what the Cain offering is because we have presented the like ourselves. We have prayed; and then have complained, just as the Jews did, that it has all been in vain, that no good has come of it. We have made sacrifices, and we have wondered that we got no reward for them. Perhaps we have been angry that, being so good, we have not been more favoured by fortune and circumstances. Perhaps we have been angry that, trying so hard to make ourselves good, we have succeeded so little. Perhaps we have had a general notion that God could not be persuaded to be gracious to us and to forgive us, in spite of all the sacrifices we have offered, and that we must try others which are more costly. In all cases, *the countenance has fallen*; in all cases, we have gone forth with thoughts that were anything but gracious and brotherly to our fellow-men. We have thought of them as more in the favour of Heaven, on one ground or another, than we were; we have felt envious and spiteful to them, if we have done them no actual mischief. Assuredly, this is the Cain spirit in us all; assuredly, we have often been led by it; and if so, have we not had a proof, the clearest that could be given, that it was not an arbitrary Being we were opposing, but a righteous and gracious Being? Was not our sin that we *supposed* Him to be an arbitrary Being, whom we, by our sacrifices and prayers, were to conciliate? Was not this *the* false notion which lay at the root of all our discontent, of all the evil thoughts and acts which sprung out of it? We did not begin with trust, but with distrust; we did not worship God because we believed in Him, but because we dreaded Him—

because we desired His presence, but because we wished to persuade Him not to come near us.—F. D. MAURICE.

THE heathen had a notion that the gods would not accept the sacrifice of any but those who were like themselves; and therefore none could be admitted to the sacrifice of Hercules who were dwarfs, and none to those of merry Bacchus who were sad and pensive. An excellent truth may be drawn from this folly: he that would please God must be like God.—W. GURNALL.

THE offering of Cain was like a beautiful present, but there was no sorrow for sin in it—no asking for pardon—and so God would not receive it. 'Mother won't take my book,' once sobbed a little boy, holding in his hand a very beautiful little volume, prettily bound. It was a present, purchased with the pocket-money which he had been for weeks saving for his mother's birthday; and now she would not have it. But she did take the needle-book and purse which her little daughter presented to her. Why did she refuse the beautiful gift of her boy? He had been naughty—selfish, passionate, false,—and had not at all repented; and so, when he brought his offering, she put it gently on one side, saying, 'No, Charlie.' He turned away sullenly, muttering that he did not care, and beginning to cherish feelings of a bad kind towards his sister. But after a while he came to himself—stole into the room, flung himself on her shoulder, confessed his fault with tears, and found favour with his mother. By and by she whispered tenderly, 'You may bring your present.' So God acted with Cain, but he would persist in obduracy of heart.—W. ADAMSON.

Sin at the door.—Sin is like a wild beast, beautiful in outward seeming, lithe and graceful in its motions; its feet shod with velvet, its strength robed in a coat of many colours. It is like a stealthy, *crouching* beast, lurking in ambush, stealing unheard and unseen from thicket to thicket, or gliding softly through the long tangled grass, availing itself of every inequality of the ground, hiding behind every trunk or bush, approaching its victim like a fate—silent, invisible, unerring.—S. COX.

WE are all apt to be deceived by the imagination that when an evil deed is done it passes away and leaves no permanent results. The lesson taught the childlike primitive man here, at the beginning, before experience had accumulated instances which might demonstrate the solemn truth, was that every human deed is immortal, and that the transitory evil thought, or word, or act, which seems to fleet by like a cloud, has a permanent being, and hereafter haunts the life of the doer, as a real presence. If thou doest not well, thou dost create a horrible something which nestles beside thee henceforward. The momentary act is incarnated, as it were, and sits there at the doer's door-post waiting for him; which being turned into less forcible but more modern language, is just this: every sin that a man does has perennial consequences, which abide with the doer for ever more.—A. MACLAREN.

THERE are laws in our personality which may be our salvation or our ruin. They may ruin us if we are ignorant; they will save us if we are wise. Now, of all these laws, there is perhaps none so important as the law of habit, according to which actions, by being often repeated, become, first of all, easier to be performed, and afterwards difficult, if not impossible, to be avoided. It is to this law of habit, I think, that the text refers, 'If thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.' Sin is here personified and represented as a beast of prey ready to spring upon its victim. Our actions have a tendency to enslave us. The wrong *deeds* which we once voluntarily chose to perform are very apt to grow into wrong *practices*, which we shall at last perform mechanically, without any choice, or even in opposition to the most earnest desire to refrain. So when a man sins he may be fairly represented, in the graphic language of the text, as having called something into existence which, like an evil beast, is waiting to seize and devour him.—A. W. MOMERIE.

Unto thee shall be its desire.—These words are drawn from the previous chapter, where they refer to the holy union of heart and affection in husband and wife. Here they are transferred with tremendous force, to set forth that which is a kind of horrible parody of that conjugal relation. A man is married to his wickedness, is mated to his evil, and it has, as it were, a tigerish longing for him, unhallowed and murderous. That is to say—our sins act towards us as if they desired to draw our love to themselves. This is just another form of the statement that when once a man has done a wrong thing it has an awful power of attracting him and making him hunger to do it again.—A. MACLAREN.

Sermons for Reference.

Cox (S.), Expositor's Notebook, 1.
Hathaway (E. P.), Ten Commandments and Lord's Prayer, 83.
Laing (F. A.), Simple Bible Lessons, 15.
Maclaren (A.), Christ in the Heart, 171.
Maurice (F. D.), Doctrine of Sacrifice, 1.
Momerie (A. W.), Origin of Evil, 98.
Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, ii. 329.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xxxii., No. 1929.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The New Edition of 'Schürer.'[1]

This new edition of a manual so well known to biblical students will be heartily welcomed. The work, which formerly consisted of two volumes, has been for some time out of print in Germany. The second of these volumes (for in this order they appeared) was published in 1885, the first in 1890. The *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* was practically a second edition of the same author's *Lehrbuch der Neutest. Zeitgeschichte.* This second edition is the basis of the well-known translation in five vols., entitled *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh), which, we are safe to say, is amongst the best thumbed of the works that make up 'The Foreign Theological Library.' In the new edition, the author has once more begun with the second volume; but what formerly extended to 884 pages has now swelled to 1146, and it has been wisely decided to divide this part of the work into two volumes. The first of these deals with the Internal Conditions of Judaism, the second with the Judaism of the Dispersion, and with the Jewish Literature. The pagination of the former edition is given in square brackets at the inner top corner of each page, and a vertical stroke | in the text indicates the point where a new page began formerly. This arrangement, it is hoped, will facilitate reference, the old Index serving meanwhile. (We may note in passing that the Index of the old work is one of the features which have contributed to the popularity and enhanced the value of the *Geschichte.* It is a feature which is scandalously and immorally lacking in most German books). The first volume, dealing with the Political History of Palestine, the author expects to appear in due time. We can only hope that the 'nicht allzulange Frist' will not be such as to try our patience.

Of the contents and characteristics of Schürer's work it is not so much our intention to speak at present, for we are not dealing with a book that needs to be introduced to our readers. We have all learned to turn to its pages for accurate information regarding the institutions of post-exilic Judaism, the manners and customs of the Jews in the time of our Lord, the characteristics of the different towns of Palestine according as the Jewish or the heathen element preponderated, the tenets of the different religious sects, and a hundred other subjects of interest. We shall therefore content ourselves with calling attention to the relation in which the new edition stands to the old. We have before us, undoubtedly, a new book, but the new is very largely built within the framework of the old, and where we have extension it is extension upon the old lines. As in the case of the last edition of Driver's *Introduction*, the main change is that the work has been brought thoroughly up to date in the way of discussing or at least cataloguing all literature that has appeared since the last edition. While here and there modifications of former views may be noticed, it is surprising how little this has been found necessary; supplement, not change, is the mark of the new edition. Unlike some German authors, Professor Schürer cites English literature largely, and we may note that 'Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*' is constantly referred to. The only oversight we have noted (and perhaps we are wrong) is that our author does not appear to be aware of the second edition of Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (Cambridge, 1897).

We have spoken of the old framework being retained in the new edition. Comparing, for instance, the Table of Contents in the two editions, we find the numbering and the titles of the sections in vol. ii. to be precisely identical. In vol. iii., in view of the new light that has been thrown upon some regions of the Diaspora, and the amount of work in recent years in the realm of Jewish apocalyptic literature, we look for more additions, although here, too, the numbering and titles of the *main* sections (those marked §) remain the same. The first slight addition we note is in § 31, where the Dispersion in S. Arabia is briefly discussed. The date to which this can be traced back is pronounced obscure, but it is certain that, at the latest, from the 4th cent. A.D., there was a strong Jewish element there. Glaser's attempts,

[1] *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.* Von E. Schürer. Dritte Auflage. Bds. ii. and iii. pp. 584, 562. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1898. Price for the two vols. M. 24; bound, M. 28.

however, to explain certain Himyaritic inscriptions of the 4th and 5th cents. as 'monotheistic,' *i.e.* Jewish, are pronounced by Schürer to be problematical.

Notice is taken (iii. 160 ff.) of the recent recovery of large portions of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus, and their publication by Schechter and Cowley-Neubauer. All the fragments belong to the same MS., and emanate, in Schürer's opinion, from the *Genizah* of the synagogue at Cairo. The MS. appears to have been written in Egypt, and to have been copied from a Persian exemplar. The voluminous literature on the subject is noticed and estimated.

The publication of the Slavonic Enoch (or Book of the Secrets of Enoch) gives occasion for a new sub-division (iii. pp. 209–213), in which the book is analyzed, and full account taken of the views of Charles, Bonwetsch, and Harnack, upon the last of whom the criticism is passed that he adopts too much from Charles.—The *Paralipomena Jeremiæ*, which was dismissed in a few words in the former edition, receives detailed treatment (iii. 285 f.). In opposition to his former opinion that this is a Christian work, Schürer is now inclined to hold to a Jewish origin for it. He bases this opinion chiefly upon the emphasis laid upon the ἀφορίζεσθαι of the Jews from the heathen, and especially from heathen wives (vi. 13–14, viii. 2, as contrasted with 1 Co 7^{12-13}, 1 P 3^{1}). The conclusion of the work, which is distinctly Christian, but comes in very abruptly, would then be a later addition.—Much fuller treatment than before is given to the pseudepigrapha attached to the name of Abraham. The *Apocalypse of Abraham*, which has been preserved apparently only in Slavonic, and of which a German translation by Bonwetsch appeared in 1897, is identified by Schürer with the apocryphal book Ἀβραάμ mentioned in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus and the *Synopsis* of Athanasius, along with Enoch, Test. of Twelve Patriarchs, and Assumption of Moses. On the other hand, he distinguishes it from the apocryphal book concerning Abraham which was used by Origen (*in Lucam* Homil. 35). The latter, again, he holds to be distinct from the *Testament of Abraham*, although Dr. James identifies the two. (Similarly detailed treatment is accorded to the legend about Joseph and Asenath, which was noticed and nothing more in the former edition. This legend will be found fully discussed in Dr. James' article 'Asenath' in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, to which Schürer also refers). An addition under the head of 'Jewish Propaganda under a heathen mask,' concerns a work by one Menander. From a Syriac MS. in the British Museum, Land published in 1862 a collection of apophthegms bearing the superscription, 'The wise Menander has said.' These bear a close resemblance to the Books of Proverbs and Sirach, as was clearly shown by Frankenberg in 1895, and there can be little doubt that we have here a Jewish work composed under the pseudonym of Menander, the well-known comic poet (cf. the large use made, for similar purposes, of the name of the Sibyl, or of Hecatæus and Aristeas).—We have to note, further, an interesting paragraph on the rhetorician, Cæcilius of Calacte, who was probably of Jewish descent. The question of his identity with the bogus prosecutor of Verres is discussed, as well as the genuineness of the pun attributed by Plutarch to Cicero, '*Quid Judaeo cum Verre?*'

We are glad to observe that Bertholet's work, *Die Stellung der Israeliten u. der Juden z. den Fremden*, which we had the pleasure of eulogizing in these pages, is appreciatively referred to by Schürer as a 'Hauptwerk.' On the other hand, we regret to see that the passages at arms between Professor Schürer and Professor Ramsay have apparently left a soreness in the mind of the former, and it is a distinct misfortune that the pages of Schürer's own 'Hauptwerk' should be disfigured by the parenthetical remark (ii. 428) that Ramsay's article on the 'Rulers of the Synagogue' in the *Expositor* (April 1895) is made up of 'schiefe und unbewiesene Behauptungen.'

The section dealing with Magical Formulæ and Magical Books is considerably expanded, and copious references are given to Babylonian, Egyptian, Arabian, and Greek literature, which will enable the Jewish beliefs on magic to be fruitfully studied from the comparative point of view. (Margoliouth's opinion that the Book of Wisdom was originally written in Hebrew is rejected). In defending the view so brilliantly asserted by Kuenen that the high priest was uniformly the president of the Sanhedrin, Schürer notices and rejects the intermediate position sought to be established by Jelski, that during the continuance of the temple there were two presidents of the supreme court,—the political head, the Nasi,

being always the high priest, whereas the head for religious, judicial, and legislative functions, was a scribe chosen from among the Pharisees (ii. 203 n). —We note one change of opinion which we cannot regard as an improvement. While in the former edition Schürer expressed the opinion that the Law which was read to the people by Ezra was the Pentateuch in essentially the same form as we now have it, he is now inclined to restrict this law to the Priests' Code (ii. 306). In spite of the weighty support which Kautzsch and Ed. Meyer lend to this opinion, we still prefer the contention of Wellhausen that the Law of Ezra is the Pentateuch, not the Priests' Code (see his argument in 2nd ed. of *Isr. u. Jüd. Gesch.*, p. 176).—A candid change of view which is more likely to command general approval, concerns the Messianic expectations of Jesus ben-Sirach. Schürer formerly held that this writer expected the everlasting duration of the nation, nay even of the Davidic dynasty. He now considers the objections of Israel Lévi (*Rev. des études juives*, 1897, pp. 44 ff.) to be valid against this view.

The monumental work of Professor Schürer, whose position was already assured, has had its claims to permanent appreciation greatly strengthened by this new edition. No better guide for the period with which it deals is accessible to the biblical student.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Piepenbring's 'Histoire du Peuple d'Israel.'[1]

Piepenbring is already known by his *Theology of the Old Testament*, which was published in 1886, and was translated into English by Professor Mitchell of Boston University, in 1893. He is not, however, so well known in this country as he should be. His *Theology of the Old Testament* is of a compass and a kind to meet the need of the average busy student better than any other book in English, but being published in America (Crowell, New York), it has scarcely found an entrance here yet.

Piepenbring's *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel* it would be a greater undertaking to translate, for it is a much larger book. But it would repay the translator. As it covers the whole Old Testament history, closing with the Maccabees, its 730 close pages cannot be considered excessive. Indeed, there is no space wasted. Piepenbring never quotes opinions merely to refute them cleverly. He has the whole literature of his subject in hand (with the inevitable exception of some good but small English books), but he refers to it in the briefest possible way in his footnotes.

His position is a moderate critical one. He writes almost directly to oppose Vernes and Renan, from whom he feels separated root and branch. Even than Stade, who commences the history of Israel with the foundation of the kingdom, and Reuss, whose point of departure is the conquest of Canaan, Piepenbring is somewhat more conservative, for he begins with the departure out of Egypt. Still he is a modern critic. He holds that modern criticism has established the composite character of the Hexateuch on a firm foundation, that it has shown the Decalogue to belong to the ethical code of prophetism, the religion of the time of David to be a mass of ceremonies and superstitions without ethical character or moral influence, and the early narratives of Genesis to be legendary rather than historical. He believes that the distinction between priests and Levites was learned by the Jews in Babylon during the captivity, and he even sides with Kosters against van Hoonacker in the controversy as to the building of the second temple.

Piepenbring's language never reaches the popular charm of Renan's, but it is straightforward and unmistakeable. It serves his purpose of offering to his readers an instructive and thoroughly reliable modern history of Israel.

Editor.

[1] *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel.* Par C. Piepenbring. Strasbourg: J. Noiriel, 1898. 8 fr.

The Social Side of the Laws of Israel.[1]

God was Israel's Lawgiver, Judge, and King. His laws were embodied in a covenant made with

[1] *Ideal und Leben.* By Dr. S. Oettli. A collection of instructive and eloquent articles on biblical, chiefly O.T. subjects.

the nation. Not that the parties to the covenant are on an equality. The covenant was a gift of Divine grace to the nation, offered to its obedience and the condition of its well-being. The two fundamental thoughts of the system are: 'The children of Israel are My servants,' and 'The land is Mine' (Lv $25^{55.\ 23}$). The two distinguishing features of the legislation are a spirit of humanity and the sense of right and justice pervading it.

1. *Security for Life.*—Whoever attacks another's life attacks Jehovah's sovereignty, and is punished with death (Ex 20^{13}). The two provisos are that the murder is intentional, and that it is attested by more than one witness (Nu 32^{20} 35^{30}). The infliction of the penalty belongs by old custom to the next of kin, the blood-avenger (Nu 35^{19}). Anyone selling another into slavery is treated as a murderer (Ex 21^{16}). If the homicide is accidental, six cities of refuge are appointed, where the slayer is safe until the death of the high priest, when he is free to leave; if he is found outside by the avenger before that time, his life is forfeit (Ex 21^{13}). A wilful murderer may be taken even from the altar (Ex 21^{14}). Thus, even accidental homicide is punished with a species of imprisonment. If a corpse is found in the open field, the elders of the next city must slay a heifer over a brook and disclaim for themselves and people responsibility for the death (Dt 21^{1}). The general principle in cases of bodily injury is the *jus talionis*. Three cases of this kind are stated in Ex 21^{22}, Dt 19^{16}, Lv 24^{17}. This might in cases be commuted for a fine (Ex 21^{18}), or not above 40 blows (Dt 25^{1}). Another case of homicide not punishable with death is the killing of a thief by night (Ex 22^{2}); but this does not apply by day (Ex 22^{3}). In the case of man or woman killed by a beast, the beast must be killed, and its owner is punished (Ex $21^{28f.}$). A distinction, however, is made between the killing of free persons and slaves (Ex $21^{20f.\ 32}$).

2. *The Family.*—Wilful adultery is punished by the death of both offenders (Ex 20^{14}). The suspected wife has to submit to the ordeal (Nu 5^{11}); the husband bringing a false charge is punished (Dt 22^{13}). A betrothed maiden guilty of unchastity is put to death with her partner (Dt 22^{23}); if she is the victim of force, only the man is punished. A man forcing a maiden unbetrothed has to pay a fine; he must also marry her, and can never divorce her. Divorce is permitted, but it is fenced in by certain limits. A divorced wife, if her second husband dies or dismisses her, may not be taken back by her first husband (Dt 24^{1}). A wife's sister may not be taken in marriage 'beside the other in her lifetime' (Lv 18^{18}). The prohibitions of marriage of relations within certain limits show similar regard for right natural instinct (Lv $18^{6ff.}$). Parental authority is maintained at a high point. A child that strikes or curses father or mother dies (Ex 21^{15}). So with a son brought by his parents before the elders as incorrigible; no further witness is necessary (Dt 21^{18}); a parent's accusation is enough. No vow of unmarried daughter or wife is valid without father's or husband's assent (Nu 30^{4}). A daughter bringing shame on her father's house must die (Dt 22^{21}, Lv 19^{29}).

3. *Slavery.*—Slavery existed in Israel as elsewhere. 'Our translation, "man-servants and maid-servants," weakens the passages somewhat. But the Roman regarded the slave as *mancipium*, the best part of his property; Israel's law honours in him the man, the Divine image.' Slavery arose in three ways. (*a*) By purchase of foreign, heathen slaves; Israelites cannot be bought and sold. (*b*) By right of war. (*c*) By debt or poverty (Ex 22^{3}, Lv 25^{39}, Ex 21^{7}; cf. with Lv 19^{29}). But in Israel there were many alleviations of the slave's lot. If a master ill-uses a slave so that he dies on the spot, the master is punished, probably by a fine; if he dies after one or two days, the loss of his services is deemed sufficient punishment (Ex $21^{20f.}$). For the loss of an eye or tooth, a slave receives freedom (Ex 21^{26}). If a slave is killed by a beast, the owner of the beast is fined, and the beast killed (Ex 21^{32}). An escaped slave must not be delivered up by one with whom he has taken refuge, so that he is not mere property (Dt 23^{15}). The Sabbath law applies to slaves (Dt 5^{12}), so the Passover (Ex 12^{1}), as well as other feasts (Dt $16^{11.\ 14}$). Israelitish slaves must be set free in the seventh Sabbatical year and the jubilee year (Ex 21^{2}, Lv 25^{8}); for other regulations, Dt 15^{12}. If the master is a foreigner or sojourner, the redemption of slaves by relatives is always possible (Lv 25^{47}).

4. *Foreigners.*—'On Israelitish soil *hospes* is not equivalent to *hostis*.' Marriage with women of foreign race was not uncommon; only the seven Canaanite peoples were forbidden ground, to whom afterwards the Ammonites and Moabites were added (Dt 7^{1} 23^{3}); Edomites and Egyptians

were gradually naturalized (Dt 23^{7}). 'Of course freedom of conscience as a formal idea was unknown to the law of Israel.' Proselytism obtained, and to proselytes by circumcision the feasts were open (Ex 12^{44}, Dt 16^{11} 31^{10}). In respect of criminal law there is no difference between foreigners and home-born (Lv 24^{22}). 'Oppress not the stranger' (Ex 23^{9}).

5. *Property in Land.* — 'The land is Mine.' God is the only landowner; the Israelites are His tenants. God's right was acknowledged in the first-fruits of the field (Ex 23^{16}), of cattle and even of men (Ex $13^{2.\ 11\text{-}13}$), in the payment of tithe (Lv 27^{30}), and in regulations of tillage (Ex 23^{10}, Lv $19^{19.\ 23}$, Dt 22^{10}). Land could not be alienated or even permanently pledged (Lv 25^{23}). Parents could not interfere with the law of primogeniture (Dt 21^{15}). Much land must have been left unappropriated to provide for the future; but even of the land occupied the Israelites were not absolute owners. 'That idea of absolute possession pushed to extremes, which has come into our law (not to its advantage) from the Roman law, is foreign to the law of Israel. Property in the absolute sense belongs only to One in the land, Jehovah, the God of Israel; His people administer and enjoy the land and their possessions under His eye, according to His regulations, within the limits He fixes.' Sons failing, the inheritance fell to the daughters, brothers of the deceased and next relatives. In no case might it pass to another tribe (Nu 36). The Levirate law had an important bearing here (Dt 25^{5}, Ru $4^{5.\ 9f.}$). Houses in a city must be redeemed within a year, or they remain the buyer's property (Lv 25^{29}); but landed inheritance could only be pledged (mortgaged) until the jubilee year (Lv $25^{14.\ 28}$); this law applied to all cases. 'The price represents nothing but the value of the annual products up to the jubilee. The amount of the pledge thus serves to cover the debt; whilst the pledge itself at last returns to the seller, and the personal demand of the creditor on him then disappears. Nay, it was open to a seller (or debtor) or his near relative to redeem his inheritance before the jubilee year; he had then only to make good to the creditor (or buyer) the supposed value of the produce of the land from the time of the re-purchase up to the next jubilee year.' 'The law consequently acknowledges property, but with religious limitations and without the severity of modern exaggerations, when the idea of property is treated amid the wreck of all other sanctities as a holy of holies. Property is not such an idol to the law of Israel; hence offences against property are not visited by disproportionately heavy punishments, while offences against human life are treated "more humanely." But certainly the will of the supreme Lawgiver in Israel draws round property definite boundaries, whose transgression is punished' (Ex 20^{15}, Dt 5^{19}, Ex $22^{1ff.}$).

6. *The Poor.*—Consideration for them is often strongly enjoined (Ex 22^{21}, Dt 10^{18}). Justice is not to be denied to the poor (Ex 23^{1}); especially is it forbidden to accept a gift against the poor (Ex 23^{8}); the poor man's necessity is not to be turned to profit (Dt $24^{14f.}$ $15^{7ff.}$). The same law applies to foreigner and sojourner (Lv 25^{35}). The approach of the Sabbatic year might check beneficence, because in it no debt could be demanded from an Israelite (Dt 15^{2}). Nevertheless, the security of a pledge was only possible within limits. The creditor must not enter the debtor's house to take the pledge (Dt 24^{10}). If a poor man's cloak is pledged—forbidden altogether in case of a widow—it must be returned before sunset (Ex 22^{26}). No hand-mill must be taken in pledge (Dt 24^{6}). All interest or usury is forbidden in the case of Israelites (Ex 22^{25}, Lv 25^{35}). 'This regulation, which passed into the canon law, did not apply to the foreigner, *e.g.* to the trading Phœnician; according to the context it does not refer to commercial intercourse proper, but only to temporary help to an impoverished brother; in the limited circulation of those days borrowing could not have been common; a debt could always be demanded, except in the Sabbatic year, and, if it was not paid, the debtor could be drawn upon for labour (see Ps $15^{4f.}$).' In later times the Jewish greed of money became proverbial. Other merciful enactments respecting the blind and deaf, fruit trees in an enemy's country, a neighbour's cattle, even an enemy's cattle, are found in Lv 19^{14}, Dt 20^{19} $22^{1f.}$, Ex $23^{4f.}$. Something is to be left in harvest time for the poor (Lv $19^{9f.}$, Dt 24^{19} 23^{24}). 'What would the Lawgiver say to children being forbidden by police restrictions to gather berries in open woods?' The spontaneous produce of the fallow year belongs to the poor and the beast (Ex 23^{11}, Lv 25^{6}). There is a triennial tithe for the Levite, the widow, the poor, the orphan, and the stranger (Dt $14^{28f.}$).

Were these laws mere ideals, or were they realized, and to what extent? It is difficult to say with certainty. But the mere fact that the prophets denounce their infringement so strongly, shows that they were not a dead letter. 'We can only assert with probability: during the days of the independence of the community we are to regard as civil law, whose validity was guaranteed by the State power, those enactments which bear on life, property, rights of marriage, parents, and inheritance, the latter in their simple outlines; in times of theocratic enthusiasm those also which guard the bases of the religion of Israel: Monotheism, the Sabbath, the Hallowing of the name of Jehovah. But at all times there was for the faithful in other important relations no other court than the conscience of the individual, or, in religious language, the secret judgment of the God of Israel. Even the law leaves a whole series of open or secret offences to His heart-searching eye and to His justice.' J. S. Banks.

Headingley College, Leeds.

Paraclete.

A BIBLE WORD STUDY.

By the Editor.

The Greek word παράκλητος is used by St. John alone. In the Gospel it occurs four times (14[16. 26] 15[26] 16[7]), and in the First Epistle once (2[1]). Some of the early versions, as the Syriac and Egyptian, took over the Greek word and did not translate it. The Old Latin, however, translated it everywhere by *Advocatus*. Jerome altered that; while he retained *Advocatus* in 1 Jn 2[1], he accepted the Greek word in the Gospel, simply giving it the Latin termination *Paracletus* (or Paraclĭtus). It was Jerome's version, called the Vulgate, which Wyclif translated. Wyclif's purpose being to render the Vulgate into a tongue which the common people of England could understand, he did not retain the form Paracletus (as the Rhemish version afterwards did, giving 'Paraclete' in the Gospel), but translated it 'Comforter.' Thus Wyclif (in both versions) has 'Comforter' in all the four places in St. John's Gospel, but 'Advocate' in the Epistle. Tindale, who translated directly from the Greek, chose the very same words in the same places, and Tindale has been followed by all the English versions (except the Rhemish, as already stated), even including the Revised Version of 1881. The Revised Version, however, has a marginal note at Jn 14[16] 15[26] 16[7]—'Or *Advocate*, or *Helper*, Gr. *Paraclete*'; and at 1 Jn 2[1] 'Or *Comforter*, or *Helper*, Gr. *Paraclete*.' Thus in the versions of the New Testament with which we are familiar the same word παράκλητος is translated in St. John's Gospel, where it refers to the Holy Spirit, *Comforter*, but in the First Epistle, where it refers to Christ, *Advocate*, and the point of our Lord's promise of *another* Paraclete is lost.

In the language of the English versions 'to comfort' is not always to console as it is in the English of the present day, and 'comfort' is not always consolation. Its first meaning, like the Latin *con-fortare* (from *con* intensive prefix, and *fortis* 'strong'), is to strengthen. Thus Wyclif's translation (1382) of Is 41[7] is 'he coumfortide hym with nailes, that it shulde not be moued' (1388, 'he fastenede hym with nailis'). Coverdale translates 2 S 2[7] 'Let youre hande now therfore be comforted, and be ye stronge' (A.V. 'let your hands be strengthened, and be ye valiant'; R.V. 'let your hands be strong'). And A.V. gives in Job 10[20. 21] 'Let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return,' a translation which R.V. retains, though the same Hebrew word is translated 'recover strength' in Ps 39[13] by both versions. We next find the meaning *exhort* or *exhortation*, as Wyclif's translation of He 12[5] 'And ye han forgete the comfort that spekith to you as to sones.' And then *encouragement* (not necessarily to goodness), as in Wyclif's *Select Works*, iii. 328, 'Not to coumforte hem in here synne'; and in Cranmer's *Works*, i. 209, 'By your comfort the vulgar people conceiveth hatred towards such things as by the prince's commandment are set forth.'

But when Wyclif chose the word 'Comforter' to express the Latin *Paracletus* (he may have coined the word out of the verb to comfort, since the earliest examples of 'comforter' yet discovered are in his writings), it is probable that the sense he desired to convey was 'one who consoles.' His translation (1382) of Job 16^2 is 'Alle yee ben hevye coumfortoures'; and this was the meaning which had been attached to the Greek word παράκλητος and the Latin *paracletus* in the Church since the fifth century. Thus Isidore (640 A.D.) says, 'Spiritus sanctus, quod dicitur paracletus, a consolatione dicitur. . . . Consolator enim tristibus mittitur.' In fact, this is the only meaning that the word 'Comforter' seems ever to have had.[1]

Does the Greek word παράκλητος mean Comforter, *i.e.* consoler, then? By derivation it is a passive formation from παρακαλεῖν. Now παρακαλεῖν certainly means to exhort, encourage, or console. But this passive form never has that meaning, until Greek Christian writers, misled by the idea (which a careless reading of the context in Jn 14 might easily suggest) that the Holy Spirit was called a Paraclete because He came to console the disciples for the loss of their Master, began to impose that meaning on it. By derivation and usage, παράκλητος means 'called to one's side.' In short, it has exactly the same meaning and origin as the Latin *advocatus* and the English 'advocate.' In all its occurrences, therefore, it should have this uniform rendering, unless there is something in the context to prevent that. A study of the context should in every case show that there is not. It is true that the word 'comfortless' in Jn 14^{18} gives a momentary support to the meaning 'consoler.' And English writers have fallen into the pit. Thus in the early work *Mirrour of our Ladye* (1530), we read 'Holy goste conforture of fatherless and motherless.' But when our Lord says, 'I will not leave you comfortless,' the word is ὀρφανούς, orphans.

Now an advocate is called to the side of one who is accused, and his business is to get the accused acquitted. He adopts two methods. First he puts the accuser into the witness-box and endeavours to break down his evidence. He shows up its contradictions, its impossibilities, its absurdities. Then he places the accused himself in the witness-box. Now he draws him on to tell his story in such a way that it will become manifest that he is not and could not be guilty of the charge brought against him. In St. John's Gospel it is the Holy Spirit that is the Advocate: in the First Epistle it is Christ Himself. But this is the office of both Advocates.

The Holy Spirit is in Jn $14^{16.\ 26}$ 15^{26} Christ's Advocate against the disciples' own unbelieving or only half-believing hearts. He will break down their unbelief by recalling to their minds the words of the Old Testament about Christ and Christ's own words about Himself, and by giving them an insight into the meaning of these words. He will also recall Christ Himself to them. His majesty, His absolute truth, His spotless goodness will be allowed to make an impression upon them. They themselves will be judges against their own unbelieving hearts, and Christ will be triumphantly acquitted and declared to be the Son of God with power.

In Jn 16^7 the Holy Spirit is Christ's Advocate against the world, the disciples being again the judges. He will convict the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment. Though the world crucified Christ as a malefactor, and now persecutes His followers as evil-doers, the Spirit will bring home to the conscience of the men of the world the fact that Jesus Christ and His followers are the right-doers, and that they themselves are the evil-doers, for whom there remaineth a fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation.

Finally, in 1 Jn 2^1 the Advocate is Christ Himself. The believer is the accused. Satan is the accuser. The Father is the judge. It is the perpetual day of judgment, the court of assize that is always sitting, as the believer is guilty of sin. 'My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not,' that is the desire of the apostle, that is how it ought to be with his children. But they will sin. And as they sin Satan stands forth as the accuser before the Father. But the Advocate appears to plead for them.

It is the scene in Zec 3 reproduced. There is Joshua the sinner. His sin is acknowledged; the filthy garments are plain to be seen. So Satan demands judgment against him; he must receive the due reward of his deeds. Then the Angel of

[1] At least there is no example of another meaning in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but I have now found an example in Lord Berners' *Froissart* (1523), where the meaning is clearly 'strengthener': 'Who durst begin such a riot as to enterprise to slay the earl's baily holding the earl's banner in his hands, doing his office, without some bolsterer or comforter in their deed' (chap. ccci. p. 229, Globe ed.).

the Lord becomes his Advocate. The judge hears the plea, and gives his verdict. 'The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan. Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?' Joshua is robed in his high-priestly garments and enters upon his office of 'Holiness to the Lord.'

So always the accused and accuser are there. But now the Angel of the Lord as Advocate becomes Jesus Christ the righteous. The sin is acknowledged, but the sinner has One who is bone of his bone, who has been tempted in all points like as he is, and yet is the righteous One. So He has a standing with the judge, the right of entrance, the right of intercession. And He is the propitiation for the sinner's sins. The sinner is accepted in the Beloved. The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; is not this also a brand plucked out of the fire?

An Archaeological Commentary on Genesis.

By A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

Bêt has-sohar, or 'prison-house,' is a very peculiar expression, *sohar* not being found elsewhere except Cant. vii. 3 where it signifies 'roundness.' The Hebræo-Samaritan, however, has *sokhar*, and it is therefore probable that the word represents the Egyptian *Suhanu*, which has been assimilated to the derivatives from the Heb. root סחר. In Old Egyptian as well as in the modern Egyptian Arabic final *n* and *r* interchange. *Suhanu* was 'the prison of the temple of Amon' at Thebes (W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 268) to which Thothmes III. carried 'the children of the Syrian chiefs as prisoners.' Maspero remarks that the name indicates 'a prison like those where the princes of the family of the Ottoman sultans were confined by the reigning monarch—a palace usually provided with all the comforts of Oriental life.' In Assyrian *sîru* (the Heb. *sohar*) means 'an enclosure of mud-bricks.'

XL. 1, 2. Among the officials attached to the Egyptian court, we find mention of 'the overseer of the kitchen,' 'the baker,' 'the butcher,' 'the overseer of the confectioners,' 'the overseer of the jar-sealers, who taste the wine,' and 'the milkman.'

8. When a dream could not be explained from the books on the subject, recourse was had to an official interpreter of them. An official of the kind is mentioned on a Greek stele from the Serapeum at Memphis.

11. Wine (*arp*) played a great part in the social life of ancient Egypt. But, instead of hearing of grape-juice being squeezed into the Pharaoh's cup, we ought to hear of the wine being poured into it. Perhaps there is here some misrendering of the original document, as in the use of the word *saris*, 'eunuch,' for 'officer' (vers. 2, 7).

15. It is noticeable that Canaan is here called 'the land of the Hebrews,' and not 'Canaan' or 'the land of the Amorites.'

16. Translate 'baskets of white bread'; the Egyptian monuments mention various kinds of bread, and show that bread made of fine wheat-flour was especially prized. There are pictures representing the bread carried on the head in baskets.

17. Fancy bread and confectionery occupied a conspicuous place in the food of the ancient Egyptians, and there was a special superintendent of the bakers of fancy bread in the palace of the Pharaoh.

19. For the body of an Egyptian not to be embalmed was the worst of punishments, as it deprived him of personal immortality in the next life. The punishment described in the text was un-Egyptian, and imported from Asia. We find Amenôphis II. similarly hanging the bodies of some Syrian kings of Takhis, after they had been put to death, on the walls of Thebes and Napata in Nubia.

20. The birthday of the Pharaoh was a day of general rejoicing. In the stele of Kubbân it is said of Ramses II., 'Horus and Set rejoiced in heaven the day of his birth.' So, too, on the Rosetta Stone we are told that on 'the birthday of the good god' (in the Greek translation, 'of the king'), which was observed as a festival, there was a gathering of the priests at Memphis and a general amnesty, all prisoners being freed.

XLI. 1. The Nile is here, as elsewhere in the Old Testament, called *Yeôr*,—Yaruhu in an inscription of Assur-bani-pal, which was borrowed from the Egyptian *Aûr*, 'the river,' of which the earlier form was *Atûr-âa*, 'the great river.'

2. Egyptian texts call the Nile a milch-cow and compare its waters to milk. The cow-headed Hathor, who was said to 'cause the Nile to overflow at his due time,' watched over the fertility of Egypt. The seven cows were the 'seven Hathors,' the seven forms under which the goddess was worshipped in the great sanctuaries of the country. *Akhû*, A.V. 'meadow,' is the Egyptian *akhû*, 'reeds,' 'river-grass,' 'water-meadow.'

6. The east wind in Egypt is really a south-east wind, and is still destructive to the crops. Vegetables are as it were frost-bitten by it, and according to the fellahin it causes the corn to rot before it becomes ripe. In calling it 'east,' however, instead of 'south,' the writer speaks from a Palestinian point of view, since in Canaan the destructive wind came from the east.

8. No light is thrown on the word *Khartummim* by either Egyptian or Assyrian monuments. If Ewald's etymology of it is to be accepted, it would correspond to the Egyptian *Rekh-khetu*, 'knowers of things,' which the Rosetta Stone translates into Greek by ἱερογραμματεῖς, 'sacred scribes,' though the latter were rather the *Kher-hebu* of earlier times.

14. Shaving and putting on clean clothes were a primary necessity in ancient Egypt before approaching the king. Cleanliness was insisted on throughout all ranks of the people, and a mark of cleanliness was that the head and face, and sometimes the other limbs also, should be shaved. In this respect the Egyptians offered a strong contrast to the beard-wearing Syrians.

38. 'The spirit of God' is an un-Egyptian mode of representing the Egyptian idea that the 'soul' of the gods could animate certain men, animals, and things. The Mnevis at Heliopolis was 'the soul of Ra,' the sun-god; and a text at Denderah tells us how the 'soul of Hathor,' in the form of a hawk of lapis-lazuli, descended from heaven and united itself to the image of the goddess, while magicians were believed to be able to summon the souls of the dead and make them speak through the lips of their mummies. Contrariwise, the 'spirits' of demons were thought to be able to possess men. But 'the spirit of Elohim' is Babylonian rather than Egyptian. In Sumerian belief, everything (the gods included) had its Zi, its 'life' or 'spirit' (Semitic Babylonian, *napisti*).

41. If Ramses II. was the Pharaoh of the Oppression—and the question has been set at rest by Dr. Naville's excavations on the site of Pithom—the four hundred and thirty years of Israelitish sojourning in Egypt takes us back to the period of the Hyksos or Shepherd kings for the age of Joseph. This agrees with the tradition in the Synkellos that Apophis was the Pharaoh of Joseph. There was more than one Apophis or Apopi among the Hyksos rulers of Egypt: in the reign of the last (Apopi Aa-ab-taui-Ra, read Aa-qenen-Ra by Dr. Naville) the war of independence broke out which ended, four generations later, in the expulsion of the foreigners, and the rise of the eighteenth dynasty under Ahmes I. (B.C. 1600). The seat of the Hyksos power was in the north, and their capital was at Zoan or Tanis, the modern San; but the authority of the first Hyksos dynasty had extended over Southern Egypt as well, and Apopi Aa-ab-taui-Ra claimed the same extent of power. An inscription of Apopi I. Aa-user-Ra has been found at Gebelên, and a Hyksos sphinx of white limestone at El-Kab, south of Thebes; and the Sallier papyrus, which gives the legendary history of the origin of the war of independence, describes Apopi Aa-ab-taui-Ra as the suzerain lord of the *hiq*, or feudal 'prince' of Thebes. The successful rebellion of the latter transformed him from a *hiq* into a *suten*, or 'king,' and enabled him to found a native seventeenth dynasty in Upper Egypt contemporaneous with the Hyksos seventeenth dynasty in the north. Although the Hyksos court had long become completely Egyptianized, an Asiatic would have met with a more friendly reception from it than from one of purely Egyptian origin.

42. In the Louvre there is a stele of the eleventh dynasty relating to the prime minister Antef, who is called a 'functionary of the signet . . . alone among the multitude he bears the word to men; he declares all matters in the two Egypts; he speaks about all things in the hall of secret counsel. . . . The princes hold themselves attentive to his mouth . . . all his words come to pass without (resistance), like that which issues from the mouth of God.' Under the Old Empire, one of the highest officials in the kingdom had the title of 'the royal seal- (bearer),' the hieroglyphic representation of the seal being that of a seal-

cylinder, similar to those used in Babylonia, attached to a string. Rich robes were the usual gift of the Pharaoh to those he wished to honour. Thus, when the political exile Sinuhit was allowed to return to Egypt in the time of the twelfth dynasty, he was given 'garments of fine linen.' Collars of gold were another usual gift. 'Captain' Ahmes, who took part in the war of independence, states in his sepulchral inscription at El-Kab, that he had been presented with 'a golden neck-chain eight times in sight of the whole land.'

43. Horses were first introduced into Egypt in the Hyksos period, and from this time forward horses and chariots were plentifully used there.

The word *Abrek* (A.V. 'bow the knee') has been explained by the cuneiform inscriptions. In Sumerian, *abrik* signified 'a seer,' and the word was borrowed by Semitic Babylonian under the form of *abriqqu*. It is given in the lexical tablets as a synonym of *abkallu*, 'a seer'; *bil terti*, 'a master of learning' (Heb. *thorâh*); *khaśśu*, 'clever'; *emqu*, 'wise'; *ippisu*, 'a magician'; *mudû*, 'knowing'; and from it was derived the word *abarakku*, the title of one of the five highest Babylonian officials, which is further explained by *barû*, 'a seer.' *Abrek*, therefore, was an official title signifying 'the seer.' That Babylonian terms should have made their way into the Hyksos court was natural enough considering its Asiatic origin, and the influence of the Babylonian government, literature, and language in Canaan.

45. The first part of the Egyptian name given to Joseph is still doubtful; but it is pretty certain that in the latter part of it we have to see the Egyptian *nti-pa-ânkh*, 'of the life' or 'the living one,' *i.e.* Pharaoh. As Ka-mes, the last king of the native seventeenth dynasty, took the title of *Zaf-n-to*, 'nourisher of the land,' Zaphnath-paaneah may be Zaf-nti-pa-ânkh, 'nourisher of the Pharaoh,' or less probably Zaf-n-to-pa-ânkh, 'nourisher of the Pharaoh's land.' The practice of giving foreigners Egyptian names was common, and the monuments contain many instances of it. Thus a Canaanite from Bashan named Ben-azan, who was the vizier of Meneptah the son of Ramses II., received the Egyptian name of Ramses-em-per-Ra.

Asenath has been explained by Professor Steindorff as the Egyptian Nesi-Nit, 'the attached to the goddess Neith.' The loss of the initial *n* in *nesi* had taken place, in the case of proper names, before the Mosaic age, since we find in the Tel el-Amarna tablets the name of Su-Bandi, *i.e.* the Egyptian Nesi-Bendidi, in Greek Smendes. As the name of Neith, the goddess of Sais, enters into that of Nit-aker, a queen of the sixth dynasty, there is no reason for asserting that a name like Asenath cannot be older than the time of the twenty-sixth dynasty.

On or Heliopolis was the city of Ra, the sun-god, and one of the oldest seats of culture and religion in Egypt. The foundation of its great temple went back to prehistoric times, and one of the two obelisks erected in front of it by Usertesen I. of the twelfth dynasty, nearly a thousand years before the lifetime of Joseph, is still the object of an afternoon's drive from Cairo.

45, 46. In the Sallier papyrus it is said of Apopi that 'the entire country paid him tribute.' As the story was written by an Egyptian scribe, bitterly hostile to the Hyksos prince, the emphatic statement that Apopi was master of all Egypt is important. The papyrus describes Apopi as holding his court at the time at Avaris, on the Asiatic frontier.

50. The high priest of Heliopolis or On ranked but little below the Pharaoh in the Egypt of the Old Empire. The office was held by royal princes, and the high priest bore the special titles of 'the far-seeing,' 'he who sees the secret of heaven,' and 'the chief of the secrets of heaven.' Under the New Empire, after the rise of the eighteenth dynasty, the office lost somewhat of its earlier power and dignity, and the high priest ranked below the civil 'governor.' It is remarkable that the Sallier papyrus expressly says: 'The impure in the city of Ra (Heliopolis) were subject to Ra-Apopi in Avaris.'

54. The statement that the famine extended from Egypt into 'all lands' indicates a Palestinian point of view, since it was Egypt only, where there was no rain, that would be affected by a failure of the Nile. In Palestine the crops depended upon the rainfall, and whether the Nile were high or low made no difference to them. Egypt, however, supplied Canaan with corn, whenever there was a deficiency of it in that country; thus, in the Tel el-Amarna tablets the governor of Phœnicia speaks of corn being sent to the starving people of Gebal and Tyre, and the Hittites of Kadesh were similarly supplied with corn by Meneptah the son of Ramses II. If, therefore, the crops failed in

Canaan during the seven years' famine in Egypt, it must have been because a deficient rainfall in Palestine happened to coincide with a series of deficient Niles in Egypt. There have been other cases of deficient Niles for seven successive years. The Arabic historian, El-Makrîzî, describes one which lasted from A.D. 1064 to 1071, and was the cause of a terrible famine. A hieroglyphic inscription, discovered by Mr. Wilbour on the island of Sehêl, south of Assuan, similarly records a famine and a low Nile lasting 'for seven years.'

It is possible that the famine of Joseph is that referred to in the tomb of a certain Baba at El-Kab, who lived in the latter days of the Hyksos rule. Here Baba is made to say: 'When a famine arose, lasting many years, I issued out corn to the city.'

56, 57. 'All the face of the earth,' 'all the earth' (not 'all lands'), is in opposition to 'the land of Egypt.' The Hebrew writer seems to have misunderstood the Egyptian idiom which called Egypt 'the two worlds' or 'lands.'

The public *larit*, or 'granary,' was an important institution in Egypt, especially under the New Empire, and 'the superintendent of the granaries' was an official of high rank. He, in fact, provided the corn out of which the salaries were paid to all the officials, soldiers, and serfs, and was consequently the finance minister of the day. Once a year he presented to the Pharaoh the 'account of the harvests of the north and the south.' The corn was collected from the estates of the Crown, as well as from the tributes of foreign nations. In Babylonia, where the Government also had a monopoly in corn, there were similar granaries, the superintendent of which was termed *satam*.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

A BURIED SPHINX. By Walter W. Crump, M.A. (*Andrews.* Crown 8vo, pp. 55. 1s. net.)

This book—probably meant to serve as a Christmas or New-Year booklet, for it is attractively produced—recalls some of the literary flavour and more of the evangelical warmth of the late Professor Drummond. It opens with a happy exposition of the heart of the two familiar texts, Jn 17^3 and 1 Jn $4^{7.8}$. Its four chapters are then described as: The Revelation of Life, The Focus of Life, The Biogenesis of Life, and The Test of Life.

MAGIC DIVINATION AND DEMONOLOGY. By T. Witton Davies, B.A., Ph.D. (*Clarke.* 8vo, pp. 130. 3s. 6d.)

The full title of this volume (which is published also in Leipzig) is 'Magic Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and their Neighbours, including an Examination of Biblical References and of the Biblical Terms.' And they who know Professor Witton Davies know with what joy he will hunt the biblical terms to the very roots under which they have rushed for refuge, and how indifferent he will be to lay out his prey for the admiration and advantage of the onlooker. The volume is indeed an amazing combination of care and carelessness, of the enthusiasm of scholarship and its indifference. It is probable that Professor Witton Davies, who has rejected the infallible authority of the pope and the Bible, deliberately declines to offer in their place the infallible authority of scholarship. These are the materials, he says; work on them, make them—as much as you find good in them—your own.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have also published another volume of their 'Small Books on Great Subjects,' *The Making of an Apostle*, by R. J. Campbell; and an attractive little book by Dr. George Matheson, *The Bible Definition of Religion*.

An edition of the Golden Legend, or rather, to use its own title, *Leaves from the Golden Legend*, has been edited by H. D. Madge, LL.M., illustrated by H. M. Watts, and published by Constable in the daintiest, most pleasing form. The same publisher has issued a serious plea for *Human Immortality* by Professor James of Harvard. It is the Ingersoll Lecture for 1898, and handles the so-called scientific attitude of some minds with skill and purpose.

HENRY ROBERT REYNOLDS, D.D.: HIS LIFE AND LETTERS. Edited by his Sisters. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* 8vo, pp. 585. 12s.)

In the life of Dr. Reynolds there was no incident beyond the ordinary. For the matter of his outward experience his name might be forgotten. It is the man that is worth remembering, and the man is found in the letters.

It cannot even be said that Dr. Reynolds' books will certainly keep his name alive. His Congregational Lecture on *John the Baptist* was the work of a fine scholar, but it was too elaborate and never took its place. The exposition of St. John's Gospel in the 'Pulpit Commentary' is yet finer, as scholarship and as spirit, but it is swamped, as he himself feared it would be, in a morass of wordy homiletics. Perhaps his great article on the same Gospel (for which he was recommended by Professor Sanday) in the new *Dictionary of the Bible* will do more than all the rest to keep his name alive.

Unless this volume does it. Truly, the letters are good reading. The combination of knowledge and broken-heartedness is not everywhere to be found. And if we may gather Dr. Reynolds' work into a sentence, let us say he lived to show that the ripest scholarship leads to the deepest evangelical doctrine and life.

But it is a book one should read, not review. There is nothing to review in it. There is a most inspiring example to follow, whom to know is growth in grace.

VIA DOMINI. By J. H. Bernard, D.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* Crown 8vo, pp. 318. 6s.)

Dr. Bernard of Dublin is one of the keenest theologians of our time. He is able to contribute some large and lasting addition to our theology. As yet, he has been content, with commendable modesty, to let us taste his penetration and catholicity in an occasional volume of theological sermons. The sermons in this volume are all theological, and nearly all severely so. That is to say, they handle the great eternal doctrines or the great persistent difficulties. But they are perfectly lucid, and, so far as they carry us, carry us easily. They then leave us with open vistas, sometimes almost into heaven, sometimes almost into hell.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have also published *The Restored Innocence*, by R. J. Campbell, in their series, 'Little Books on Religion,' edited by Dr. Robertson Nicoll.

Mr. Hunter of Edinburgh has been appointed agent in this country for four of the most recent books published by the New York firm of Wilbur B. Ketcham. They are good books, and deserve a circulation here. We have had many manuals on preaching recently, but Dr. Kern's volume on *The Ministry to the Congregation* has a distinct and considerable value. It is distinct because it makes less of the sermon and more of the worship. And it is separate from most works on homiletics in that it cures actual faults and suggests actual improvements in the conduct of public worship, eschewing generalities. The other volumes are: *Thanksgiving Sermons and Outline Addresses*, compiled and edited by W. E. Ketcham, D.D.; *The Gospel of Spiritual Insight*, by Charles F. Deems, D.D., which is an exposition of St. John's Gospel, original and arrestive, as all Dr. Deems' work was; and *The Pastor's Pocket Manual for Funerals*, by Dr. Joseph Sanderson, with an introduction by Dr. W. M. Taylor.

THE COMMANDMENTS OF JESUS. By Robert F. Horton, D.D. (*Isbister.* Crown 8vo, pp. 375. 6s.)

Dr. Horton lives in the thickest press of modern social life. And he finds the commandments of Jesus good there. He has no prejudice in favour of any commandments in themselves. He takes the commandments of Jesus in preference to all others, because he finds them fit, he finds that they work. He finds that they work in the hottest surge of modern social intercourse, and he uses no sugar to cover their pill withal. Certainly, he does not say that the beggar who asks for an old pair of shoes at the door should be offered the pair you have on your feet. He does not see nor believe that Jesus said that. But if he finds principles in Jesus, not practices, he makes practices out of the principles. He insists on the very heart of Jesus' commandments being carried into the very heart of the world's converse. It is a modern book, but the commandments of Jesus are more modern than the last effort to live them.

Messrs. Isbister have also published a striking practical exposition of St. Paul's words in 1 Co $4^{4,5}$, by the Rev. George Jackson, B.A., under the title of *Judgment: Human and Divine.*

DEPTH AND POWER OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By the Rev. Arthur Hoyle. (*Kelly.* Crown 8vo, pp. 195. 1s. 6d.)

It is a small book to follow so great a title. But it is a book of sermons, and every sermon ought to, as here every sermon does, show the depth and power of the Christian faith. Mr. Hoyle is a scholar as well as a preacher. He is exact as well as fervent. He is able to show that the keenest search for truth is on the side of the great Christian doctrines.

Mr. Kelly has also issued another edition of Professor Davison's delightful book on the Psalms, *The Praises of Israel*, the best popular introduction to the Psalter in the English tongue.

THE PERFECT LIFE. By W. J. Knox Little, M.A. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. 368. 7s. 6d.)

Canon Knox Little has convictions and the courage of them. And so he always finds an audience, not only for his spoken but for his printed sermons. His audience is not universal. It is probable that there are some who would rise and go if they had accidentally come to hear such a sentence as this: 'What has been known as "the Nonconformist Conscience"—with which, let it be plainly said, religious Nonconformists have nothing to do—is a handy expression for the most vulgar and revolting form of hypocrisy.' His audience is not universal; but it is sufficient for a good circulation, and it is well content. So Canon Knox Little describes the Perfect Life. It is the life, not actually lived yet perhaps, but sought after, by the devout member of the Anglican Catholic Church. By others it cannot be lived, notwithstanding that its text is, 'Be ye perfect, as your Father which is in heaven is perfect,' for it includes the Seven Sacraments, and yet it excludes their Western and Eastern interpretations. Trying to look at this ideal of the Perfect Life from without, one sees that it is not perfect even as an ideal; one sees, indeed, some most curious imperfections in it, especially in its preference for St. James over St. Paul. But yet it is a reasonably full, varied, interesting life, as long as it *is* a life. Its risk lies in insisting upon it that circumcision is everything, and so letting slip the vital principle itself, when, behold, its multiplicity of interest has become ghastly grimacing.

THE MINISTERS OF JESUS CHRIST. By J. Foster Lepine. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. 261. 5s.)

Mr. Lepine has examined the references to the ministry in the Bible. He has begun with the first hints of priesthood in Israel. He has ended with the last directions of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus. He has striven to let Scripture speak for itself, and tell us who the ministers of Jesus Christ are. What he considers them to be, he does not hide. But that is of less account. The value of the book lies in the completeness of its Scripture testimony and the clearness with which that testimony makes its impression. Now this is *the* question at present in dispute. Not the question of three orders *in* the ministry, but the question whether there are three orders of which the ministry is one—God, men, and ministers. All the ritualistic controversy turns on that. And the *materials* at least for answering it are found in this book in admirable completeness and array.

MAXIMS OF PIETY AND OF CHRISTIANITY. By Thomas Wilson, D.D. (*Macmillan.* 8vo, pp. xx, 169. 5s. 6d. net.)

This is the second volume of Mr. Relton's 'English Theological Library.' Mr. Relton is himself the editor. In an introduction of some twenty pages he tells us all we need to know of Bishop Wilson and of his *Maxims*. Then he gives us the Maxims themselves in most perfect form, and schools himself to add at the bottom of the page such notes as are absolutely necessary to their understanding, and nothing more. Mr. Relton is familiar with the *Maxims*. His cross-references are most useful, and betray a great working familiarity. And if we feel bound to confess that we do not yet rate the *Maxims* quite so high as Mr. Relton does, we hasten to confess also that we do not know them half so well. Of their fitness for 'The English Theological Library' we have no doubt; to their general thoughtfulness and invariable sound sense we give heartiest witness.

THE DIVINE DRAMA. By G. R. Pike. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. 378. 6s.)

There is a difference between American and English thought that occasionally expresses itself clearly—in this book almost glaringly—and which

prevents the full enjoyment on our part of some of the best American theology, and no doubt on their part of some of our best. We set a limit to the philosophy of the Gospels, they do not. If you preach the gospel in America you may bring it into relation with all the philosophies and speculations in the world, and you will be the more accepted. We are, perhaps nervously, averse to speculation. We insist on the written word and your proof text. This volume is full of matter and probably of truth, but, even when its 'ground-plan' is the Lord's Prayer, we always feel uneasily that we know not where we are. Yet it has carried a message to its countrymen at once practical and very pleasant. We too may come to this. Why should we not?

Messrs. Macmillan have also issued the *Charge* delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury at his first visitation (8vo, pp. 39, 1s. net).

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have published an American volume of considerable interest and use for young men. Its title is the one word *Possibilities*, and it encourages us to seek and show what can be made of ourselves, of one another, of all that we possess. Messrs. Marshall have also issued an unpretentious but precious little book by the Rev. G. H. C. MacGregor, M.A., *The Things of the Spirit*. It gathers together all that the Word says about the Holy Spirit, and arranges it under appropriate and suggestive headings. A truly inestimable manual of doctrine and devotion.

Mr. Melrose has sent for review the five published volumes of his 'Books for the Heart.' They are uniform in size, paper, binding, and uniformly attractive in all these ways. They are the books that a book-lover loves to handle, rejoices to have. But they are more. They have something that separates them from the ordinary attractive book of devotion. It is their editor's introduction. How rarely does the introduction to a book of devotion fall in with the tone of the book. How rarely does it fit the language. These introductions are as choice in spirit and as just in expression as the books they introduce. And yet the books are our devotional classics. The editor's introduction, to use his own language about John Woolman's *Journal*, 'has a strange piquancy, a subtle spiritual perfume, a spontaneous and easy unwontedness, a music as of the better country.' The editor is the Rev. Alexander Smellie, M.A.

This is the list of the volumes that are issued—we promise a great reception for them—

Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*.
St. Augustine's *Confessions*.
John Pulsford's *Quiet Hours*.
Jonathan Edwards' *The Religious Affections*.
John Woolman's *Journal*.

There was a time when Scotland shared the glory of offering the people Bibles so well printed and so firmly bound that they invited to daily reading and would not wear out. Then Scotland lost that glory. The time came when the people would not rest content with the Bible pure and simple, however printed and bound, but must have assistance in the reading of it. So Oxford and Cambridge and London ran away with the production of Bibles because they gave great books of 'Helps' at the end of them. But Scotland will win the glory back. Messrs. Nelson & Sons of Edinburgh have just produced a Bible which is as finely printed and perfectly bound as any Bible could be, and it contains a book of 'Helps' called *The Illustrated Bible Treasury*, which, being the latest, is the best of its kind.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO PHILEMON. By Archibald Kelly MacMurchy, M.A. (*Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier*. Crown 8vo, pp. 200. 3s. 6d.)

This is not the first time that the single sheet of the letter to Philemon has provided 'copy' for two hundred printed pages. But it compels one still to ask if the ends of the gospel are served thereby. That St. Paul ever contemplated such a thing, or would have countenanced it, goes without refuting. Still, our preachers do it. One of the greatest did it a year or two ago. And this is a worthy companion to Dr. Maclaren's book. If such extensive 'lecturing' does serve an end, this example of it will serve that end.

THE CHILDREN'S PRAYER. By James Wells, D.D. (*Oliphant*. Crown 8vo, pp. 189. 1s. 6d.)

The Lord's Prayer is the Children's Prayer, says Dr. Wells, and then proves that by making it the subject of a series of children's sermons. They are well within the capacity of the little ones; they are lit up by frequent anecdote; they never wander out of the way of the gospel message.

Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier have also published a stirring religious story by H. E. Colter, under the title of *In the Heart of the Hills.*

EXCAVATIONS AT JERUSALEM, 1894–1897. By F. J. Bliss, Ph.D. and A. C. Dickie, A.R.I.B.A. (*Palestine Exploration Fund.* 8vo, pp. 374, with Plans and Illustrations. 12s. 6d.)

Dr. Bliss has written a graphic narrative of his work at the walls of Jerusalem during the four years that his firman lasted. And he has had his work illustrated in the fullest, happiest way by his colleague, Mr. Dickie. While, to complete and crown a heroic undertaking, the 'Fund' has produced the whole in a sumptuous and yet serviceable volume. The story is not new to those of us who have read the *Statement* recently. But it is newly told, and told with more literary grace here. Nor are all the illustrations new. But they also come in better form, and they are much more numerous. Besides some five and forty in the text, a few of which are daintily coloured, there are twenty-nine plates, and there are three very useful plans in a pocket. Thus the book is a wonder of cheapness. For the history of Jerusalem it is of course indispensable. Moreover it clears up (or occasionally makes less obscure) some interesting Bible passages. Indeed, it is an expositor of the most unflattering and undeniable character. To Bliss and Dickie and to the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund the thanks of all students of Scripture are deeply due.

A GOOD START. By C. H. Spurgeon. (*Passmore & Alabaster.* Crown 8vo, pp. 329. 3s. 6d.)

From Mr. Spurgeon's writings it must have been easy to gather material for a young man's gift-book. The chapters are biblical and forcibly expressed. The teaching, as Sir George Williams in his introductory note says, is wise and sagacious. Nor is the young woman ignored. One of the most pithy chapters is on 'the eccentric woman' who 'broke an alabaster box of precious ointment upon the head of Jesus.'

Messrs. Passmore & Alabaster have also published Spurgeon's *Illustrated Almanack* and *John Ploughman's Almanack* for 1899, as well as *A Cluster of Camphire,* being 'words of cheer and comfort for sick and sorrowful souls,' by Mrs. Spurgeon, a pretty Christmas booklet.

THE HOLY LAND IN GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY. By Townsend MacCoun, A.M. (New York: *Fleming H. Revell.* 16mo, two vols., pp. 96 and 136, with 154 full-page maps. $2.)

We have rarely seen more attractive volumes in the realm of science than these; in the department of Hebrew geography and history we have never seen anything like them. In the first volume the Holy Land is described, not minutely, but with a sense of proportion and the 'lie' of it, and the description on each page is illustrated by a beautiful map on the opposite page. The second volume contains the History of Israel. Again its minute matters are passed over, its great moving episodes described. And always the transaction is made real and memorable by a good map on the opposite page. The maps are the great feature. They seem to be accurate, they are of the utmost practical usefulness, and they are so exhaustive. We have nothing like this in our country yet.

Messrs. Rivingtons have issued other two volumes of 'The Books of the Bible,' *Amos* by Principal Burrows, and *II. Samuel* by Mr Lonsdale Ragg. The minimum of commentary, and that the most accurate possible (though Mr. Ragg should not speak of vols. ii. and iii. of Smith's *Dictionary* as if they were published thirty years later than they were)—these are the distinctive characteristics.

WOMEN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By W. F. Adeney, M.A. (*Service & Paton.* Crown 8vo, pp. 276. 3s. 6d.)

In the same series, called 'The Popular Biblical Library,' Dr. Horton wrote on the Women of the Old Testament. Professor Adeney deprecates comparison with 'that delightful work.' That is natural—the deprecation, we mean. For Professor Adeney lacks the irresponsible brilliancy of Dr. Horton's character-drawing; but he has scholarship and sympathetic restraint. These are the more useful, no doubt the truer, studies of the two.

CHRIST FORESHOWN. By the Rev. R. J. Golding-Bird, D.D. (*Elliot Stock.* Crown 8vo, pp. 190. 5s.)

It need not be supposed that a man who finds a type of Christ in the furniture of the tabernacle and the passage of the Jordan is oblivious of the

historic method of interpretation. Such types are excellent to point a moral and enforce a lesson, if they are not used as texts to prove a doctrine. Dr. Golding-Bird is steeped in the typical method of interpretation and passes the other by; but he does not transgress scientific law, and he gives us much helpful suggestion.

Mr. Elliot Stock has also published *The Christian Year in Relation to the Christian Life*, by James W. Bishop; a cheaper edition of *The Seven Churches in Asia*, by the late Dr. Mackennal; *A Short Guide to the Reading of the Prophets*, by Nicholas Burgh; and *Was Man Evolved?* by J. W. Morden.

Do Sunday-school teachers know the *Sunday School Teacher?* It is a monthly magazine of rare flavour, edited by the Rev. Alexander Smellie, M.A., and published by the Sunday School Union. It is also a yearly volume, when bound, of merit to live and be at one's hand in emergencies, whether of rest or of labour. For it contains short addresses that are ours in a moment, and it contains literary and devotional papers that are ours and a joy for ever. It is instructive also, and honours its readers by holding them capable of intellectual effort. There are chapters on the Plants of the Bible by Mr. Henslow, and on the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament by Professor Bennett. Nor should the illustrations be overlooked. If they are sparing, they are accurate and actually illustrate.

From the Advance Publishing Company of Chicago we have received two volumes by Mr. C. M. Sheldon, the author of *In His Steps*. They are both stories of similar earnest intent to that impressive book. Their titles are *Robert Hardy's Seven Days* and *The Crucifixion of Phillip Strong*. The last has also reached us in a finer binding and altogether very pleasing shape from the Sunday School Union of London.

A DIALOGUE ON MORAL EDUCATION. By F. H. Matthews, M.A. (*Sonnenschein*. Crown 8vo, pp. 257.)

There is one advantage in the dialogue method of writing on education: it gives the reader a chance of seeing the other side. Of course the dialogue shows the author winning, and his may not be really the winning side. But as it goes there are chances for the other side, and we see at least glimpses of both. Mr. Matthews' ideas on Moral Education are here made to win, and on the whole they deserve it. But we may be allowed to say that in respect of the teaching of religion, as it is called, we think they scarcely deserve to win. Still, we see both sides. Nay, the other side has a clever, forcible advocate. We see both sides with perfect plainness. So altogether the book, which is never dull, may be found on the right side. And it will at least make its readers think—the greatest need of our time.

Messrs. Sonnenschein have also published a fresh, piquant book on *The Evolution of Christianity*, by Ramsden Balmforth; and a new and enlarged edition of *Ethical Songs*, compiled and edited for The Union of Ethical Societies.

FOR CHRIST AND THE TRUTH. By H. J. Martyn. (*Williams & Norgate*. Crown 8vo, pp. 233. 5s.)

Some of the chapters of this book are simply sermons, with more or less instruction and edification. But some are apologies for the faith, addressed to the least believing of those who will listen to a preacher at all. The first starts, indeed, with the question of the actual existence of Jesus as a man and Mr. Grant Allen's jaunty remark that 'recent researches like Frazer's would seem to suggest the idea that he was a mythical being.' Mr. Martyn thinks he can do something even with that.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY NEW TESTAMENT. (London: *Mowbray House*. Crown 8vo, pp. 254. 1s. 6d.)

The title is purposely audacious. It is a translation into the English of to-day—which will presumably be the English of the next century also—of the Greek text of Westcott and Hort. This is the first part, and goes to the end of Acts. And it is no fool's enterprise. It has cost thought and earnest endeavour. Its diction is never ridiculous though often unexpected; its apology is the ample one that the New Testament was written in the vernacular of its own day. The Pharisees will laugh it to scorn, of course, but the Pharisees are always given to the building of prophets' tombs, and why not build tombs to King James's translators?

'A Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions.'[1]

Just the book we wanted at present. The same work had been suggested by me to a friend, whose labour now becomes superfluous. We are in the possession of so great a number of Aramaic inscriptions, most of them scattered in books and periodicals not accessible to all, that it was sometimes nearly impossible to ascertain whether some word or proper name is found in these inscriptions or not. Only part of the proper names had been collected by Ledrain in 1887. Now Cook has taken the words and names from all Aramaic inscriptions at present known: Nabatæan, Palmyrene, Sinaitic, Egyptian, Syrian (including those of Zenjirli), Mesopotamian. As far as I can see, the collection is complete and reliable. It is, however, a glossary, not a concordance, and it is a pity that the author does not give us the principle of his quotations. It would be important to know *exactly* where some word has been used. In this point Cook may have followed some principle, which I am not able to discover. But he certainly had no clear rule for his comparisons of the inscriptional words with words from the Aramaic dialects. It is impossible to see in his book, for instance, which words of the Westaramaic inscriptions are found in the Westaramaic dialects known to us, and which words probably are of no Aramaic origin at all. It would not have been so difficult to enhance the value of the glossary by statements of this kind. Nevertheless, we thank the author for what he wished to give us.

Gustaf Dalman.

Leipzig.

Dale of Birmingham.[2]

In the *Life and Letters* of Dr. Reynolds of Chesthunt, which belongs to the books of the present month, there is found a letter from Dr. Dale of Birmingham. Dr. Reynolds had just published his Congregational Lectures. Dr. Dale speaks of *his* Congregational Lectures: 'My *Lectures* are practically ready. If I were anxious about personal reputation, which I trust God has given me grace to renounce, I should be sorely troubled at the contrast between your volume and mine. I, poor wretch, have been living in crowds, fighting the Tories, fizzing about in committees, etc., while you have been slowly accumulating your wealth, and making it your own by meditation. Yet I have some hope of making the great truth (the Atonement) clearer and more credible to some minds. Hand and foot, brain and muscle, there is place for all in the great body of Christ.'

After making allowance for the exaggeration of genuine modesty, that letter is a fit enough account of the life of Dale of Birmingham. 'I never hear Dr. Dale,' said John Bright (we quote from memory, for we cannot find the place again), 'but I think of the church militant.' The marvel was that he could fight so much and find time to preach at all, not to speak of writing theology. But he was a man of practice. His theology was part of his intensely practical active life. If he *had* been anxious for his personal reputation he ran some risk of vanity over those very Congregational Lectures. They reached a circulation that far outran those of Dr. Reynolds' on John the Baptist. He had abundant testimony that they accomplished the ends for which he says he wrote them. And it was all because Dr. Dale's theology was practical. It came out of pressing needs, it met pressing needs. Dr. Reynolds is greater as a student, greater as a seer, perhaps. But he saw too far for the most. Dr. Dale was a seer also. He saw just far enough.

Dr. Dale was a seer. He had many enemies while he lived, and now they are building his tomb, whereby it is shown that he was a prophet. He had also the prophet's defeat. Where did the victorious prophet ever appear? In himself, in his faith, he was victorious often; but not in the world. It was hard in the end to see all he had fought for snatched from his grasp by a mere turn of the political wheel, even the friends he had fought with snatched from his friendship. But the prophet has that tribulation to pass through always.

So Dale's Biography is also a history. As in a glass we see the times in which he lived, as indeed we see them in the books of the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah. The men, too, of the time are here, the great and the little. And already we see them being judged out of the things that are written in this book.

[1] *A Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions.* By Stanley A. Cook, B.A. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1898. 8vo, pp. viii, 127. 7s. 6d.

[2] *The Life of R. W. Dale of Birmingham.* By his Son, A. W. W. Dale. Hodder & Stoughton. 8vo, pp. 771. 14s.

Sermonettes on the Golden Texts.

By the Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A., Aberdeen.

I.

'In Him was life; and the life was the light of men.'—John i. 4.

When we come across a passage in some of the poets that speaks home to us, and charms by its beauty of thought and power of expression, we sometimes say, 'That's poetry.' We do not qualify the statement by any adjective. We do not say that it is good poetry. It is higher praise to say simply that it is poetry, meaning that it is worth calling poetry. And so the Evangelist, while he could not be briefer in his statement, at the same time could not put it more forcibly when he says of Jesus, 'In Him was life.' It is worth calling life.

St. John no doubt uses the word in a very wide sense as applied to Christ. He is the Source of all life, He is the Support of all life. But let us take it, for the time being, in a narrower sense. Looking simply at the life Jesus lived on earth, in its beauty, its restfulness, its power, we are constrained to say, 'That is life.' It was a life bare of earthly possessions, He had nowhere to lay His head; but Jesus had the true secret and treasure of life in that He had always somewhere to lay His heart. It was a life separate from sinners in its purity, yet so wondrously near to sinners in its sympathy. It was a life that won the hearts of children, and drew also the outcast publicans and sinners. Children and publicans—in some respects, the best and the worst in the land—were alike attracted to Jesus with the firm assurance that in Him they had a Friend. And it was not merely by what He said, even though He spake as never man spake, that such as these were drawn to Him, and that the common people heard Him gladly. The words, once used of another, apply far more truly to Jesus, 'There was something finer *in* Him than anything that ever He said.'

How true that that life has been the light of men! But for Christ, life would be very dark and meaningless. It would be a hopeless thing, with no outlook. It would be a heartless thing, with no sustaining power. Like all light, the light of Christ is a revealing light. It reveals the value of the human soul. What shall a man give in exchange for his soul? In the light of Christ's teaching, that is a question with no answer. The kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, are not equal to it. The dearest thing to God's heart is that it might be saved. It reveals also the needs of the human soul. Christ has shed a light that shows to us our destitute condition. We should not know, but for Him, how low we had fallen, and how helpless we lie.

But, still further, Christ reveals Himself as the Saviour and Restorer of the soul. It has been remarked that, when we look upon a landscape lighted up by the sun, we enjoy the scene and never think of the sun by whose light we behold it; whereas, when we look upon a landscape lighted up by the moon, by and by we turn, naturally and almost unconsciously, to glance up at the orb under whose gentle light we stand. And it might be said that of a similar nature to this latter is our action with respect to Christ. Beholding our hearts as He has illumined them, not from any enjoyment of the view in this case, however, but simply from a sense of desolation, we turn away from self, and look up to Him who has shed that light upon us, and who has also made Himself manifest and bright as the Redeemer and Life-giver.

May we find in Him our life and light; may we follow on more and more to know the Lord, and be able to say—

> I looked to Jesus, and I found
> In Him my Star, my Sun;
> And in that light of life I'll walk,
> Till travelling days are done.

II.

'And looking upon Jesus as He walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God!'—John i. 36.

Not grudgingly but gladly St. John the Baptist hands over his disciples to the higher Teacher. He has fulfilled his office as the friend of the Bridegroom. Many would even have acknowledged himself to be the Messiah, but self never in the least eclipsed his message. Not an envious word crossed his lips, and not even a thought entered

his mind that could not have been whispered into Christ's own ear. He stepped down with willing feet from his pedestal, declaring that now his joy was fulfilled. Henceforth 'He must increase, but I must decrease.'

Notice three things in the text,—a great sight, a great saying, and a great sequel. First, *a great sight.* 'Looking upon Jesus, he saith, Behold.' It was the first time that anyone was directed to Jesus. What multitudes since then have been pointed to that same Source, and have found in Him what they sought elsewhere in vain! Four times we read in the Gospels of special attention being drawn to Christ by that word; not all of them, however, in the reverent spirit of the Baptist. 'Behold how He loved him!' said the simple villagers at the grave of Lazarus. 'Behold the Man!' said Pilate; a commonplace utterance on his lips, but his words were wiser than he knew. 'I thank thee,' Roman, 'for teaching me that word.' 'Behold, now ye have heard His blasphemy. What think ye?' said the high priest, as eager to get anything of an incriminating kind as were the French military staff against Dreyfus. 'Behold the Lamb of God!' said St. John to his disciples, and, on the previous day at fuller length, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!'

Here, then, secondly, we have *a great saying.* Whence had John that wondrous knowledge of the purpose of Christ's coming? Flesh and blood had not revealed it unto him. There were A.D. people who lived in B.C. times. So says Zangwill, the writer on modern Jewish life, and we might use his words here in a higher sense than that in which he meant them. St. John the Baptist was one of the A.D. people, the last and greatest of the B.C. times, whose privilege it was to open the door and let the King come forth. The Christian world has not even yet fully fathomed the depth of that saying of the Baptist. Yet we may be blessed by it even though we do not fully understand. The source of the Nile was long mysterious, but that did not hinder the people of Lower Egypt from profiting by the beneficent stream, so long as it flowed and overflowed and made the land fruitful. And so, while there are mysteries in the Atonement that Heaven alone, perhaps, will explain, trusting hearts have ever found its results a blessed reality in their experience. Forgiveness, life, and fruit have ever been the effects of that grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, and whose springs are hidden in the heart of God.

Thirdly, we have here *a great sequel.* Where, you may say, is the sequel in the text? Why, it is in the whole verse, it is in the fact that we have the verse at all. One of the two, there is every reason to believe, who heard John's words that day was the writer of this Gospel. And that day was an high day in the story of our race, for these two followed Jesus, the first of the countless number out of every kingdom and tribe. And here are we to-day, privileged to read of, and meditate on, that incident of the far past. May we, too, seek with all our heart that Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, and then truly it will be a great sequel, also, so far as we are concerned.

III.

'This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His glory; and His disciples believed on Him.'—JOHN ii. 11.

THIS was the starting-point in Christ's public career, and it was a fitting beginning for Him Whose life was to be described so well in the words, 'Who went about doing good.' First things are significant. He began at a wedding, the happiest day in two lives that were then united, and began from that time to go down the long path together. Who the bride and bridegroom were we do not know, nor anything of the story of their united life which began that day; but surely a wedding of true hearts should be looked back upon as the happiest day of life, especially when regarded in that high and holy sense which led Tennyson, for example, to say of his marriage day: 'The peace of God entered my heart as I stood beside her at the altar.'

Was it not symbolically fitting, then, that Jesus should choose the happiest experience of earthly life as the time when He began to manifest His glory? For His relationship to men was to be one of a very close and permanent kind. The Bible can find no more fitting figure for the relationship between Christ and His Church than that of the Bridegroom and the Bride. And is it not true, here above all, that the peace of God entereth the heart that is united to Christ by faith?

This beginning was significant, too, in its transformation of the water into wine. That symbolized what Jesus came to do in many ways. Above all, He transformed religion. The religion

of the time was a dry, heartless, burdensome thing. Even good men, well-intentioned men, made it a yoke too grievous to be borne. But Christ revealed it as a joyous thing. There was a beautiful simplicity and homeliness, too, in Christ's way of putting things. And certainly they do not seem the less heavenly because they were so homely. It is true that, notwithstanding its bright and joyful aspect, there will always be something corresponding to Gethsemane in every Christian life; but even there we may have the helpful assurance that Jesus will not fail, as the disciples did towards Him, to watch with us, yea, and to be to us more than the strengthening angel that appeared to Himself of old.

We are told that, as the result of this manifestation of His glory, His disciples believed on Him. They believed already, for they had joined themselves to Him as His disciples; but by this sign their faith was confirmed. Still, their belief was not of a very high order, for it was long, as we know, ere the full light regarding Jesus' mission dawned upon them. They never dreamed that the Cross, with all its darkness, lay between them and the higher, clearer faith, and that their faith now was as water unto wine compared with what it would one day come to be. It needed the dawn of the Resurrection morn to make plain to them the nature of the Kingdom.

But they loved Jesus, and loved Him all through. Even after his denial St. Peter could still say, 'Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee.' Their love saved them, and, after long perplexity and seeming disappointment, they were uplifted in faith to heights whence they beheld the true land of promise. They loved Jesus with all their heart, and that love carried them on, through darkness and doubt and even despair, till at last the funereal gloom of the Cross was turned into the wedding joy of the Resurrection.

IV.

'For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'—JOHN iii. 16.

THERE is not a superfluous word in this verse. You could not make it shorter without injuring to some extent the meaning. When you are sending a telegram you pay particular attention to your words. Any unnecessary words you omit, while, at the same time, you are careful to have sufficient to convey your meaning. Now, suppose we had, instead of a whole volume concerning the heavenly message, only what might correspond to a telegraphic despatch. I should say that our text would be a sort of perfect telegraphic message. Every word tells. Nothing could equal it in the way of summary of gospel truth.

The wealth of the text is embarrassing. Let us confine our attention to two great thoughts in it. The first is that God *loved and gave.* These two things must always go together. You might give without loving, but you can't love without giving. It is of the very nature of love to give. The sun could no more exist without shining than could love without giving. St. Paul tells us many things, in his wonderful eulogy of love, that it does. Love beareth all things, for example. But love is not satisfied with bearing. Jesus, in His love, bore our sins; but far more than that He came to do—not only to bear but to bestow. At the same time, it is possible, St. Paul reminds us, to bestow all our goods, and yet not have love. That just means that, in love's giving, there must always be a bit of self. It is the measure of self that is in our gifts that gives them value in the highest sense.

You may have noticed that in connexion with the Christmas cards you have recently been getting. Here is one card, say, with a verse upon it, which you find, when you read it, is entirely inappropriate to your condition. Evidently the sender had just purchased almost the first card he laid his hands on, without giving the matter any further consideration,—and you value it accordingly. But here is another with a verse that speaks home to your special need. You may have passed through some sorrowful experience, and the words, you find, are peculiarly fitted to your case. The sender had been thinking about you, and had taken some pains to find a card that would specially suit you. It is a trifling gift, but the giver put something of himself into it. He gave you a little thought and consideration, and that bit of self in the gift enhances its value and touches your heart. Well, what a wondrous gift God gave to men, when He gave His Son! That was not a giving out of His superfluity. That was not a giving without consideration of our case. We needed a Saviour, and, when there was none other to save us, God spared not His own Son. Verily God gave Himself when He gave His Son.

There are other two things that are coupled together in the text,—*believing and living*; and these two are as inseparable as the loving and giving. Knowledge is power, it is true, but faith is power in a far higher sense. In the Bible it is faith that is at the root of every good man's life, every man who did, or became, anything worth recording. It was not talent or genius that made Moses encounter all the difficulties in Egypt. He had these, too, in large measure, and he had sympathy with his Hebrew brethren. These and other helpful qualities he had, but it was faith in God that strung them all together, it was faith that united and energized them. And so, through every life that had anything of the good and true in it, faith runs as a solo, and at last, in the eleventh chapter of the Hebrews, all is summed up in one grand chorus, the time failing the writer to tell of all who through faith subdued kingdoms and wrought righteousness.

A faith like that means life, life here and now, the life more abundant, the life everlasting, the life that can enter the very gates of death singing—

> When the breath of life is flown,
> When the grave must claim its own,
> Lord of life, be ours Thy crown—
> Life for evermore.

V.

'But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.'—JOHN iv. 14.

WOULD it be a desirable condition to be in, never to experience the sensation of thirst? Is not thirst a healthy sign, and hunger too? There is an old riddle which runs somewhat as follows:—What is that which we try to get, and no sooner do we get it than we try to get rid of it? The answer is an appetite. There is nothing more pleasant than a good appetite, if you have the means of satisfying it. A newspaper correspondent, writing on the recent Soudan campaign, speaks of what he calls the Soudan thirst, and the delight of quenching it. Only, it is terrible should you not have the means of quenching it. The irony of it, he says, is that there is so much thirst there, and such a limitless means of supply here. 'If the Soudan thirst could be sent home in capsules, it would make any man's fortune in an evening.' But the demand and the supply may be far separate.

Now, what Jesus clearly meant, by that saying to the woman of Samaria, was not that thirst shall cease, not that 'desire shall fail,' but that it will be abundantly satisfied. There will still be the demand, it will be greater than ever, but, as to the supply, it will be as a well of water *in* him, springing up into everlasting life. How shall we put it? A constant desire and a constant satisfaction, a craving and a possession, a desert thirst by the side of the water brooks.

There is a longing in man's soul for that which this world can never supply, but it is found in Christ. What a hopelessly sad condition would humanity's be if there were that longing, and yet nothing to satisfy it!

> Better the ox that lies fat and supine,
> Even his gross contentment can never be mine.

It is sometimes said that the mere search after truth is in itself pleasant. Well, in some ways that is true enough. Did you ever search for a four-bladed clover? Whether you got it or not, the afternoon among the fields and in the sunshine was very pleasant all the same. But just imagine a mother searching for her lost child, and sitting down in the middle of the search, before she had found again her treasure, and saying, 'Well, this is delightful. There is an exhilaration about it. I hope to find my child ere long, but meantime the search itself is very stimulating'! Nay, there could be no joy for her, save the joy of discovery. And so is it with the heart longing and searching for God. 'Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee.' In some things we may find pleasure even in search that comes to nothing; but, when it comes to be a longing soul,—a soul seeking to be rid of the burden of sin, seeking for a sustaining cup of joy,—there can be no satisfaction save in the finding.

Christ, then, both satisfies and increases our soul thirst. He can become, as it were, a well of water in us springing up into everlasting life. And all other professing or supposed sources of supply have been found, and ever will be found, to be but as

> A sinking buckets into empty wells,
> And growing old in drawing nothing up.

Contributions and Comments.

Pereunt et Imputantur.

THE Hour-glass in the Pulpit—
  Such was the ancient plan,
What time some quaint old preacher spake
Words that bade slumbering spirits wake,
  In the days of good Queen Anne.

The Hour-glass in the Pulpit
  Has a message for to-day:
'Another Sunday'—so it seems to say—
'Another Sermon: ah, how many more,
Preacher, until thy tale of days be o'er?
  The hour-glass sands run fast,
  And time will soon be past,
Preach to thyself! And, when thou preachest, pray!
  But one short hour have I—
  Thou hast Eternity.'

A. H. BROWNE.

The Rectory, St. John's, Newfoundland.

The Name 'Caiaphas.'

THE commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter, which has just been published from the lectures of the late F. J. A. Hort (Macmillan, 1898), contains an additional note on 'The Names of St. Peter,' (pp. 151–153). There we read—

'The name Καιάφας is, on the whole, probably a twin form of Κηφᾶς, taken from כיפא, as Κηφᾶς from כאפא. The only difficulty is that the Syriac (including Syr. vt. in L 3^2, the only extant place) has ܟ (ק), not ܟ (כ).'

The editor (Dr. Chase) has added a note that the same form (ק) is found in four places of the Syriac manuscript from Mount Sinai. After some further remarks about other etymologies proposed for the name, Professor Hort closes—

'The *Onomasticon* explains Καιάφας by *ἰχνευτής* and *περίεργος* (de Lagarde, *Onom. Sacr.*, pp. 175, 203; cf. pp. 60, 67).'

It is strange that two such scholars as Hort and Chase overlooked the fact that not only in the Syriac version, but also in a Jewish source, the name is written with ק (see Schürer, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, German ed. ii. p. 167, note 544; p. 169, note 550 [Eng. tr. iii. pp. 197, 199]), and that the true etymology was given long ago by the *Onomasticon* (see above), and by de Lagarde (*Übersicht*, pp. 97, 111; *Mittheilungen*, iv. 18). Καιάφας or Καϊφᾶς (Cod. D) is the Arabic قايف, 'the soothsayer'; cf. Jn 11^{51}.

In Blass' *Grammar of the Greek of the New Testament* (p. 17, note 4 of the German edition), a similar misstatement occurred about this name. I hope it has been corrected in the English translation.

The Syriac scholars identified the high priest Josef, who bore the surname Kaiaphas, with the author of the *Jewish War*; see Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Kanons*, v. pp. 155, 438, and the *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 3610. The *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* has ܩܝܦܐ in Jn 1^{43}, but 'Caiaphas' everywhere with ק. The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of Mrs. Lewis (*Studia Sinaitica*, vi. p. 123) spells ܩܝܦܐ (ק) for Κηφᾶς (1 Co 15^5). In the *Bible Dictionary* no etymology is given.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

On Mark xii. 42 and xv. 16.

IN Dr. Zahn's excellent *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. ii. (1898), pp. 251, 4, I find the statement (which may be found in other works as well) that the Roman origin of Mark's Gospel is proved not only by the Latin words employed in it, but also, and more especially, by some passages where a Greek word is explained by a Latin equivalent. In 12^{42} we read: λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἐστιν κοδράντης; and in 15^{16}: ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστι πραιτώριον.

As I have spoken of the first of these passages in my *Philology of the Gospels*, I shall be brief here. The addition ὅ ἐστιν κοδράντης seems to prove that this Gospel was written outside of Palestine, where the small coin called λεπτόν was in common use; but it may have been written anywhere else, so far as this is concerned, since the Roman coins, like the quadrans, were in circulation throughout

the whole Roman empire. Zahn, in order to show that the quadrans was unknown to Greeks, gives a passage in Plutarch, who, in his Life of Cicero (chap. 29), expressly declares that the κουαδράντης was the smallest Roman coin. But the words in Plutarch run thus: τὸ δὲ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νομίσματος κουαδράντην ἐκάλουν,[1] namely, in Cicero's time, and seem to imply that in Plutarch's own time the quadrans was no more in use, and for that reason, of course, unknown to his readers. Cp. Mommsen, *Römisches Münzwesen*, pp. 761 f., 764 ff.[2] On the other hand, the form κοδράντης, instead of κουαδρ., distinctly shows that in earlier times the quadrans was familiar to the Greeks.

The other passage requires a very careful treatment. Οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον. In Matthew (27^{27}) the corresponding words are: τότε οἱ στρ. τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, παραλαβόντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον; in John the πραιτώριον, that is, the palace of Pilate, is mentioned as early as chap. 18^{28}: ἄγουσιν οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον . . . καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον. Now, in the first place, it is an impossible supposition that anybody who could read a Greek book stood in need of an explanation for the word αὐλή, in its usual meaning. Secondly, the very worst interpretation of αὐλή would be πραιτώριον. So the words in Mark, as they stand, seem to give no satisfactory sense. When we turn to the various readings, we find in Jerome's version and in three MSS of the so-called Itala (c. ff.[2] l.), as also in the Coptic and Æthiopic versions, *in atrium prætorii*, which we understand at once. That Jerome made his version conform strictly to his 'ancient' Greek copies is an undoubted fact, so that the reading τοῦ πραιτωρίου, instead of ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον, although supported by no extant Greek MS., must be considered well established. It would seem that this reading is the better of the two, and that the only question remaining is, how the other originated. One might find the answer in my hypothesis that the original Gospel of Mark was in Aramaic. Both readings converge in a supposed Aramaic דפרטורין, which meant, of course, τοῦ πραιτωρίου, but might be translated by ὅ (ἐστι) πραιτώριον (inasmuch as ד is originally the relative pronoun, although it is commonly employed to introduce the genitive). A blundering translator might render the Aramaic words in this way, and another translator, the traces of whose work are frequently to be found, especially in these last chapters of Mark (see *Philol. of the Gospels*, pp. 196 ff.), might give the correct translation.

Nevertheless, the real solution of this puzzling problem lies in quite another direction, and the clue is given by the various readings of D a. e. ff.[2] (k) 9, Origen in 15^{1}: θήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον εἰς τὴν αὐλήν (words omitted by the rest of the witnesses) καὶ παράδωκαν Πιλάτῳ. The Latin k gives εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον (and in v.[16] simply the same words), and so has John in the corresponding part of the narrative (18^{28}). So although πραιτώριον never can be used as an explanation for αὐλή, 'court' (in its original sense), nevertheless we see that αὐλή itself might be used metaphorically for a 'palace' (much like the English 'court'), and that for this αὐλή the proper explanation was really πραιτώριον. Nor is this fact altogether new. Grimm (German version) gives as instances of this signification Mt $26^{3.\,58}$, Mk 14^{54} (??)[3] 15^{16}, Lk 11^{21}, Jn 18^{25} (?);[4] for other authors see the dictionaries. It is true that in none of the New Testament passages is the meaning 'palace' so distinct as in Mk 15^{1} D, where the word means not 'palace' generally, but *the* palace of the chief governor, that is, the πραιτώριον. But Mark is consistent with himself; he says, in v.[16], not εἰς τὴν αὐλήν as before (D v.[1]), but ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, 'into the inner part of the palace.' Now, what becomes of the words ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον? The explanation is correct, and necessary too, because of the ambiguity of the word; but this necessity results from the author's using the ambiguous αὐλή instead of the unambiguous πραιτώριον. If D's reading in v.[1] is genuine, he did not even feel the necessity of

[1] It is true that the Cod. Matritensis (collated by Ch. Graux) gives Ῥωμαῖοι κουαδράντην καλοῦσιν.

[2] Mommsen's statement is not very definite; but he says, speaking of the time of the earlier emperors (p. 761 f.): 'Die Nominale waren—der As, der Semis und *wahrscheinlich* der Quadrans, doch scheinen die Semisse seit Pius, die Quadranten schon seit Trajan nicht mehr geprägt zu sein.' Plutarch died in Hadrian's time.

[3] There is a difference between Mark and Matthew. The former has: ὁ Πέτρος ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν ('court' in the proper sense) τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, whereas the latter says (26^{58}): ὁ Π. ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἕως τῆς αὐλῆς ('palace') τοῦ ἀρχ., καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἔσω, κ.τ.λ.

[4] The words τοῦ ἀρχιερέως after αὐλὴν are omitted by the common Syriac and the Sinaitic Syr. versions, and also in the paraphrase of Nonnus.

an explanation when he used it first. So both the readings, ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον and τοῦ πραιτωρίου look much like glosses by a very ancient reader, or else by the translator or translators, if the corresponding Syrian word (דרא) had the same double meaning. In any case, this passage by no means proves what Zahn thinks, the difference being not between a Greek and a Latin word, but between a homonym and one of its equivalents. That this equivalent was originally Latin is utterly unimportant since its adoption into Syriac clearly proves that it had become a common expression among the natives of the East.

F. Blass.

Halle.

The Old Latin Versions and Westcott-Hort's Theory of the Traditional Text of the New Testament.

After long neglect, the so-called 'Western' text is being gradually recognized as a factor which cannot be overlooked in the textual history of the Greek Bible. This means that the Old Latin Versions, which form so important a group of the 'Western' authorities, must be carefully taken into account in elucidating the problems of textual history, so many of which remain unsolved.

Dr. Hort, as is well known, did invaluable pioneer work in classifying the O.L. texts of the N.T. (no doubt provisionally) under three types: 'African,' 'European,' and 'Italian.' This classification, which seems to hold good, with certain modifications, for O.T. also, rested on a minute survey of the evidence. Since it was made, various opinions have been held as to its validity; for the boundaries between the several subdivisions are naturally fluctuating. We wish in this note simply to draw attention to an interesting fact which at least corroborates Hort's basis of classification, and affords, we believe, an important glimpse into the concealed history of the texts.

P. Thielmann (*Archiv für latein. Lexikographie*, ix. Heft 2, p. 247 ff.) had, by an exhaustive discussion, proved that in the O.L. text of *Ecclesiasticus*, while chaps. 1–43, 51 are 'African,' chaps. 44–50 might be justly called 'European.' This conclusion resulted from a close investigation of the vocabulary, tested by the evidence of Fathers, etc. Some time ago we had occasion to collate some chaps. of the O.L. of *Ecclesiasticus* with the LXX. The following significant facts came to light. In chaps. 42, 43, 51 ('African,' according to Thielm.) the proportions in which the Latin text stood towards the leading Greek MSS were (roughly) these—

B = 16 : ℵ = 10 : A = 11.
B = 15 : ℵ = 10 : A = 12.
B = 15 : ℵ = 9 : A = 5.

In chaps. 44, 45, 50 ('European,' according to Thielm.) the proportions (roughly) were—

B = 5 : ℵ = 11 : A = 11.
B = 11 : ℵ = 17 : A = 24.
B = 8 : ℵ = 12 : A = 14.

Two of the MSS have virtually changed places in the transition to the 'European' family. A has taken the place occupied by B. That is to say, a revision has been made in which the text of A has counted as a far more important factor than it did previously. How can this be accounted for? We are certainly in the region of hypotheses, but we believe that Dr. Hort's acumen again points the way towards a solution. What kind of text has Cod. A? Where it stands in sharpest contrast to those of B or ℵ, as (in N.T.) in the Gospels, it has, Hort says, 'a fundamentally Syrian text' (N.T. vol. ii. p. 152). What is the 'Syrian' text? Hort believes it was an attempt made at Antioch 'to remedy the growing confusion of texts by the editing of an eclectic text combining readings from the three principal texts, itself further revised on like principles, and in that form used by great Antiochian theologians not long after the middle of the fourth century' (*op. cit.* pp. 145, 146). This hypothetical 'revision' has been treated as a most gratuitous assumption by the more strenuous defenders of the Traditional text. But do not the phenomena of the O.L. mentioned above strengthen Dr. Hort's position by suggesting at least that this 'revision,' which led to the prominence of 'Syrian' texts, such as A in the Gospels, probably holds for the LXX also? It seems more than a coincidence also that the 'European' type of the O.L. takes its rise (in all likelihood) in the fourth century, just at the time when Hort supposes the 'revision' to be asserting its influence. We believe that another fact corroborates this position.

In no part of the O.T. (LXX) is there a more marked contrast between A and B than in

'Judges.' But we can compare with these divergent authorities the probable text of that recension of the LXX made by Lucian of Antioch (240–312?) and published by Lagarde (*Vetus Testamentum Græce, Pars Prior*, Gött. 1883, Genesis–Esther) from the cursives 19, 108, 118. Even a rough and cursory comparison of the three texts shows that while A contains other elements, it has an extraordinarily close connexion with Lucian: A and Lucian constantly agree against B; B and Lucian very rarely combine against A; while Lucian differs enormously from B. Surely Professor Sanday does not go too far when he attributes this 'revision,' which, as we have seen, seems to hold for O.T. as well as N.T., directly to Lucian of Antioch himself,[1] who must then be regarded as the father of the Traditional text.

H. A. A. Kennedy.

Callander.

Malchus' Ear.

Dr. Abbott, in his *St. Thomas of Canterbury* (noticed in The Expository Times for last December, p. 139), refuses, for certain reasons that he states, to accept St. Luke's account of the restoration of Malchus' ear. Now, without discussing whether Dr. Abbott might not have accepted the miracle in question even on some of his own principles, I feel constrained to ask how it happens that, if Malchus' ear was really cut off (as Dr. Abbott himself assumes), the accusers of Jesus did not bring forward that fact at the trial before Pilate. Unless I have overlooked some material element in the case, I should be inclined to hold that Jesus' accusers would have recognized such a fact to be the very best weapon that they had against His cause, and that they would have made use of it to the utmost. How, then, is their silence to be explained? Did they not dread that the slightest reference to this matter might have furnished Pilate with certain information that they did not wish him to have?

Duff MacDonald.

Motherwell.

On the Meaning of שִׁלְטֵי.

With reference to the interesting examination of this difficult word by Dr. Barnes in a recent issue, it may be worth while giving the note which the late Dr. Frederick Field contributed to the discussion of Jer 51[11] in the Old Testament Revision Company. He allows 'fill the shields' to stand in the text, but expresses in the margin his preference for the rendering 'suits of armour.' This meaning [I now quote his own words] is supported by Aquila, 2 S 8[7] *τὰς πανοπλίας τὰς χρυσᾶς* (Vulg. *arma*); and Symmachus, 2 K 11[10] (Vulg. *arma*); also by Vulg., Ca 4[4] *armaturam.* In Ca, *l.c.*, and Ezk 27[11] the שִׁלְטֵי are 'hung from the walls,' which suits this sense (Thucyd. iii. 114: *τὰ δὲ νῦν ἀνακείμενα ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς ἱεροῖς . . . τριακόσιαι πανοπλίαι*) at least as well as that of 'shields'; and in this place of Jeremiah 'filling' is more easily explained of a 'suit of armour' than of a 'shield.' In Ca, *l.c.*, the שֶׁלֶט is distinguished from the מָגֵן, and in 2 Ch 23[9] we have 'spears and bucklers (מָגִנּוֹת) and שִׁלְטֵי.'

J. H. Burn.

[1] *Oxford Debate on Textual Criticism*, p. 29.

The Fatherhood of God.

'Mr. Williams says that St. Paul and St. John (he means the New Testament writers generally outside the Gospels) do not preach and do not hold the doctrine that God is the Father of all men' (The Expository Times, Dec. p. 204). Does not the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, at anyrate, teach this doctrine in chap. 2[14], 'Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, He also Himself in like manner partook of the same,' R.V.? Bishop Westcott, in his *Christian Aspects of Life* (p. 152), referring to v.[17] of this chapter, says, 'Our gospel shows us that we are one family, because we are children of one Father. Christ became flesh, *not to establish our connexion with Him, but because it existed.* "It behoved Him," we read literally, "He was bound," it is a marvellous phrase, "to be made like unto His brethren."'

William Clifford.

The Rectory, Colne.

1 Pet. i. 2.

On *πληθυνθείη*, Professor Hort in his lectures justly remarks that this added verb evidently comes from the *εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη* of Dn 4[1]

6^{25}. 'St. Peter prays not only for grace and peace, but for their multiplication; that is, in all probability, that the trials through which the Asiatic Christians are about to pass may *result in a manifold increase of grace and peace.*' By the latter interpretation perhaps a little too much weight is given to this formula. For that it was a common form of letter-writing in Jerusalem at that time is shown by the letters of Rabban Gamaliel, which all begin, שְׁלָמְכוֹן יִסְגֵּא, 'may your peace get much increase,' even if they do but announce the time of the tithes, or the intercalation of a month.[1] The latter might have been adduced also to v.[1]; for it is addressed to the 'Sons of the Diaspora of Babel, the Sons of the Diaspora of Mede, the Sons of the Diaspora of Greece, and the rest of all Diasporas of Israel.' How much do the New Testament writings gain of life when studied in the light of contemporary documents!

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Origin of the Name יהוה.

IN the October number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 48), Professor Hommel calls his *Ancient Heb. Tradition* 'a sorely-abused book.' It would have been better to specify the 'abuse' of his book than to give vent to vague and unfounded complaints. At all events a reasoned criticism of a statement made by Professor Hommel in the work above named cannot be called an abuse of his book. I have no fear, therefore, of being charged with abusing it if I subject to examination the derivation of the name *Jahweh* which he claims as his own, along with some other recent remarks on this theme.

1. It would be a long process to enumerate all the attempts that have been made to discover a non-Israelitish root from which the name יהוה could have originated. On the present occasion I am not to catalogue these. Regarding the earlier attempts, reference may be made to my *Hauptprobleme*, 1884, pp. 29–33, and to Driver's article with which the *Studia Biblica* of Oxford made such a brilliant commencement (1885). On the theory that there is a Chinese parallel to יהוה, see the *Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift* (1889), p. 703. The supposed parallel was reached thus: *Tao*, the first principle of all things, is called *i*, because one does not see it when it is visible to one, and the same *Tao* is called *hi*, because one does not understand it when one hears it, and *wei*, because one does not reach it when one seeks to touch it. *I-hi-wei*, however, is not *one* word like יהוה. But also within the last few years the attempts have been continued to discover a non-Israelitish root for the name *Jahweh*.

(*a*) A prince of Hamath is named in 2 S 8^{10} יוֹרָם. But even if one lay no stress upon the fact that the LXX offers Ἰεδδουράν, and that in the parallel passage (1 Ch 18^{10}) the reading is הֲדוֹרָם, yet the possibility must be reckoned with that the God of Israel had, in the time of David, gained entrance into the Pantheon of Hamath. Further, H. Winckler, in *Altorient. Forschungen*, Bd. i. (1893–97), p. 13 ff., has made it extremely probable that *Izrijau* (or *Azrijau*) of *Ja-u-di*, who defended nineteen territories of Hamath against Tiglath-pileser III. (*c.* 738 B.C.), was not *Azaryahu* of Judah (2 K 15^{6}), who, being a leper, was at that date represented by his son Jotham. The land of *Ja-u-di*, which was situated to the north of the Orontes, has now become known to us from the monuments of its own kings. It is the land יאדי whose king Panammu erected the Hadad stele which was dug up at Zinjirli. Again, the king who was dethroned by Sargon II., in the year 720, also bore the name *Jau-bi-'di* as well as *Ilu-bi-'di* (cf. *e.g.* Tiele, *Bab.-Assyr. Gesch.* pp. 239 f., 259). This use of the name *Jau* permits of the same explanation as is above suggested for *Joram*. Finally, G. Hoffmann (*Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, 1896, p. 249 f.) remarks that *Jâhû* (*sic*) is portrayed upon a coin (see Stuart Poole, *Catalogue of Greek Coins*, p. 109, Nos. 1, 2, etc.) as a bearded man (with the name appended in Aramaic יהו), in a long robe, who holds in his outstretched left hand a sparrow-hawk or eagle, and is seated upon a winged wheel (cf. the chariots of the sun in 2 K 23^{11}). But one is quite entitled to see in this inscription יהו a product of non-Israelitish syncretism. For G. Hoffmann himself adds: 'the Phœnicians, who adopted gods from the whole world, introduced Jâhû also into the sanctuary of the Sicilian (*sikelischen*) Adrianos.'

(*b*) W. Max Müller, in his *Asien und Europa* (1893), has shown that as early as Thothmes III. ('mindestens 16 Jahrh.') the West-Palestinian place name *ba'-ty-a* or *ba't-yâ* (p. 162) or *ba'-t'-y-'â* (p. 312) occurs. This is the only evidence which

[1] See G. Dalman, *Aramaeische Dialektproben*, 1896, p. 3.

he gives. I add this remark because he draws the inference that 'this use of the name proves that the central Palestinians regarded *Jahu* as a (or the ?) principal god' (p. 313). This conclusion appears to me to be insufficiently supported by the above observation, and we are warned against such general judgments in the pertinent remarks which Kuenen once made by way of opposition to Land, and which will be found reproduced in my *Hauptprobleme*, p. 33 f.

(*c*) In the Tel el-Amarna letters there are a number of compound names containing the element *Ai*, or *I*, or *Ja*. For instance, we have *Aiab* in *Keilinschrift. Bibliothek*, Bd. v (1896), No. 237[6. 12] (cf. the mutilated *Ja-ab* in 223[2] 240[b3]), *Ai-dag-ga-ma* in 139[28. 37. 60a], and often *I-ta-ka-ma* in 119[25] etc. This last example is cited by Hommel (*Anc. Heb. Trad.* p. 220), who adds the assertion (p. 115) that also the name *'Izèbel* (1 K 16[31] etc.) contains the Divine name *I*. Now one learns from the admirable *Oxf. Heb. Lex.* (p. 33[a]) that in *C.I.S.* i. 158 the name בעלאזבל occurs. The latter name may have been shortened to אזבל 'for the purpose of avoiding the name Baal,' as D. H. Müller suggested, and the secondary form איזבל 'may have suggested to the Hebrew ear the idea of *un-exalted*.' But, according to Hommel, this princess of Sidon would have differed from her father *Ethba'al* (1 K 16[31]) in having as one element in her name a form of the name Jahweh. What an ironical game she played with her name, being, as she was, the bitterest enemy of the Jahweh worship! Hence I should prefer the suggestion, that in איזבל the Phœnician אי 'island' (Bloch, *Phön. Glossar*, *s.v.*) is present along with a derivative from that verb זבל which forms the second part of בעלאזבל. The Assyr. *zabâlu* is = 'carry' (Del. *Assyr. Hdwörterb.*, 1896, 250[b]), and on יִזְבְּלֵנִי (Gn 30[20]), etc., see *Oxf. Heb. Lex.*, p. 259[b]. Thus the name *'Îzèbel* might mean 'island (or beach) of loftiness' (cf. the Assyr. *bît zabal*, 'lofty house,' in *Oxf. Heb. Lex.*, *l.c.*). This name might be an honourable appellation of Phœnicia, and an expression of the national pride. Further, Hommel (p. 116) gives to the name *Îkabod* the sense of 'Jahweh is honour'—contrary to the positive indication of 1 S 4[21]. As little reason is there to seek for the Divine name *'I* in the names אִיתָמָר (Ex 6[23] etc.) and אִיעֶזֶר (Nu 26[30]; LXX Ἀχιέζερ). These may contain the negative *'î* (Job 22[30]). The Divine name *'I* is found by Hommel also in the form אִישַׁי, which in 1 Ch 2[13] replaces the common form יִשַׁי (1 S 16[1] etc.). Now the transition from *jishai* to *'îshai* can be accounted for by phonetic causes, and this transition has parallels; cf. יוּבַל (Jer 17[8]) with אוּבַל (Dn 8[2f. 6]), etc. (see my *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 460). Besides, in other instances, word forms found in Chronicles are secondary; cf. *Dammeseḳ* (2 S 8[5f.]) with *Darmeseḳ* (1 Ch 18[5f.]).

(*d*) The element *Ai* (or *Ya*) is found also in Assyr. proper names, *e.g.* in *Ai-kalabu*. This name is, according to Hommel (p. 113), of Arabian origin, because a Mas'æan in the 7th cent. B.C. is called *Ai-kamaru*. Between the 9th and the 7th cent. we met with the name Abu-Ai, 'father is *Ai*,' etc. (*ibid.* p. 144 f.). This Divine name *Ai* 'probably came in from Arabia' (p. 224), cf. '*Ai* or *Yah* (perhaps = Bab. *ai*, 'heaven,' but masculine') (p. 225). There is, further, an Edomite king's name *Ai-rammu* (p. 113). Perhaps this is one ground for the assertion, 'Jahweh was highly, although by no means exclusively, honoured in Edom, Moab, Ammon, and by the Kenites' (Carl Niebuhr, *Gesch. des ebräischen Zeitalters*, 1894, p. 308 f.). Perhaps Niebuhr was thinking also of the Ammonite *Tobijjah* (Neh 2[10] etc.), but, seeing that this name belongs to so late a period, it may also be derived from the circumstance that the cult of the God of Israel had found friends also among other nations (Mal 1[11] has a present sense, cf. LXX. προσάγεται). The form 'Jahveh' is not urged by Niebuhr in the sentence I have quoted from him, as is done by Professors Sayce and Hommel in the title, '*Yahveh* in Early Babylonia' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, ix. 522, x. 42). For in the name *Ya-ú-um-ilu* there is nothing more than 'the syllable *ya* (*i-a*) with the Semitic nominative ending and mimation' (x. 42). With this is connected a question as to Hommel's assertion that 'Jahu or Jah was the older (not shortened) from *Jahve*) form' (*Altisr. Ueberlief.* p. 115). Where does he get the form *Jahu*? I find in his book only *ai* or *ja* as an element in Assyr. proper names, and 'the nominative ending' *u*, which presents itself in *Yâum* (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, x. 42), is no guarantee that the Divine name itself consisted of more letters than are found written elsewhere, namely, *ai* or *ia*.

(*e*) What value for the explanation of Gn 4^{26} has the existence of the ancient Divine name *ai* or *ja*, which is read in the Tel el-Amarna letters and elsewhere in the cuneiform literature? Professor Sayce writes in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (ix. 522), 'the fact (of *Ya-um-ilu*) bears out the statement of Gn 4^{26} that in the time of Enos men began to call upon the name of the Lord.' But in the Heb. text of Gn 4^{26} the reading is 'the name of Yahweh,' and this form of the name is neither found in the Inscriptions nor was it revealed in Israel in the time of the patriarchs, for Ex 6^{3b} runs, 'by my name יהוה was I not known to them' (see a full discussion of this passage in my *Einleitung*, pp. 165 f., 195). Now I concede willingly the possibility that in the remark made in Gn 4^{26} an echo is heard of the non-Israelitish and pre-Mosaic acquaintance with a Divine name *ai* or *ia*; but the difference between this name and the form Yahweh which is named in Gn 4^{26} is not to be passed over. Nor can the fact be forgotten that the history of Israelitish proper names is not very favourable to the assumption that *ai* or *ja*, or a similar word, was a pre-Mosaic Divine name amongst the Israelites.

2. *How* out of the pre-Mosaic roots of the name יהוה did this form arise? If this root was pronounced *ai* or *ja*, or otherwise, *how* came it, through the medium of Moses, who received a manifestation of the transcendental world out of the bush that burned with fire and was not consumed (Ex 3^{2}), to be transformed into the form יהוה, God of Israel, 'from the land of Egypt' (Hos 12^{10})?

(*a*) Not only Ex 3^{14}, but also the orthography of the name יהוה, and the pronunciation Ἰαβέ which is witnessed to as that of the Samaritans by Theodoret (on Ex 6^{3}), commend the view that the original Divine name *Ja* or the like was combined with a form of the old verb הוה (Gn 27^{29}). The form *Jahwe might* suffer the process of apocopation, and thus become *Jahu*, just as *jishtaḥwe* ('he will cast himself down') has become *jishtaḥw* and *jishtáḥu*, or *saḥw* has become *saḥu* ('swimming'). The by-form *Jeho* is, according to Hommel (p. 225), 'directly shortened from *Jahve*,' but he has not expressed himself regarding the nature of this process. In Gesenius-Buhl (1895, p. 296*a*), it is said that *Jahw* became *Jehaw*, and the latter became *Jeho*. This is not absolutely impossible, because, *e.g.*, מְעַט shows that a medial guttural favoured the nominal type *q'ṭal* (*Lehrgeb.* ii. 66 ff.). But there is no trace of an actual *Jehaw*, and the form *Jao* is not to be forgotten, which Diodorus Siculus (i. 94) has handed down in the words, *παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· Μωυσῆν τὸν Ἰαῶ ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν, κ.τ.λ.* The *o* of this form *Jao* may be an instance of the gradual assimilation of vowels which is illustrated in my *Lehrgeb.* ii. 487, and the *e* of *Jeho* has analogies in יִעְרֶ, etc. (*ibid.* 507). Besides, several groups of Heb. words have lost their vocalic termination. This was occasioned, above all, by the very frequent usage of a word. Thus the preposition עֲלֵי became עַל, etc. (*Lehrgeb.* ii. 303 ff., 449 f., 526); cf. also the *status absolutus* (!) *qāw* (Ezk 47^{3} etc.). From the point of view of common use the Divine name occupied a first place. Hence it was possible *Jah* should be pronounced instead of *Jahu* (Ex 15^{2} etc.). The correctness of this derivation is perhaps confirmed by the circumstance that many proper names are written promiscuously with either *Jahu* or *Jah* (cf. *Hizkijjahu* 2 K. $18^{13.\ 17ff.}$ with *Hizkijjah* vv. $^{14-16}$).

(*b*) H. Grimme maintains in his *Grundzüge der Heb. Accent- und Vocallehre* (1896) that *Jahu* was lengthened by the ending *èh*, and that so *Jahwèh* became the plural or collective form of *Jahu* (p. 143). But even if there be a collective ending *aj* or *èh* (cf. my *Lehrgeb.* ii. 119, 435, etc., and *ZATW*, 1897, 176 f.), yet it cannot be assumed that a *proper* name was supplied with a collective or abstract ending. Also the other position of Grimme, that *Jahweh* was avoided in compound proper names because of its collective ending, is untenable. For *Elohim* might as well have been used in a proper name as in *'atta 'elohai*, 'thou art my God' (Ps. 143^{10} etc.). But *Elohim* had a synonym which was easier to pronounce, namely, *El*, and this was naturally preferred in compounds. In the same way, in forming compound proper names, *Jahu* or *Jah* as the shortened forms of *Jahwe* might be preferred. Grimme's theory is disapproved also by J. Kerber (*Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Heb. Eigennamen*, 1897, p. 88).

3. What is the sense of the form יהוה, as derived from the verb הוה?

(*a*) My opinion is that the interpretation based upon the words 'I am that I am' (Ex 3^{14}) is the correct one. Accordingly, *Jahweh* designates the Being who is in the highest degree *independent* and *self-consistent*. At present we are not to unfold this idea further. This interpretation is defended also in *Oxf. Heb. Lex.* 1894, p. 218^{a}, and by P. Kleinert (of Berlin) in his article, 'Zur Idee des Lebens im AT,' in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1895, p. 704.

(*b*) Professor Hommel (in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, x. 48) claims priority for the view that יהוה is shortened from *Jahweh-el*, 'God will be,' in the sense of 'God will be with us.' He co-ordinates Jahweh with the names *Ikun-ka-ilu*, 'may God be (exist) for thee,' and *Ibshi-na-ilu*, 'there came for us into existence' (*Altisr. Ueberlief.* p. 100), and with the Ethiopian name *Jekuno-'amlâk*, 'may God be (exist) for him' (*Expos. Times*, x. 48). But (*a*) in these examples the word

'God' is mentioned, whereas in *Jahweh* it is wanting. This gap in Hommel's proof I can supply. For the so-called logical subject, and in particular the great subject, 'God' has not infrequently to be supplied (*e.g.* Job 23^3, La 3^1). But (*β*) in *Ikun-ka-ilu* the verb of existence possesses a complement, namely, *ka*, 'for thee,' etc. This complement represents the predicate of a noun sentence (see my *Syntax*, § 338 t–y), and is the most important element in the sentence. For instance, in *Ikun-ka-ilu* the emphasis lies upon 'for thee.' Hence *Jahweh* cannot mean 'God will be with us,' for thus there would be wanting not only the subject, but also the main element in the sentence. Direct evidence is borne by the name עִמָּנוּאֵל (Is 7^{14} $8^{8.10}$) that the verb 'to be' (the copula) may more readily be wanting than the predicate.

(*c*) The view that יהוה means 'he who causes to fall' (lightning, etc.) is again favourably received by G. Hoffmann (*Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, 1896, p. 250, '*Jahwe* gehört in die Classe Gewittergott') and by Ch. Piepenbring in his newly published *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, 1898, p. 49: 'Jahvé était d'abord essentiellement le dieu du tonnerre.' Hoffmann offers no proof whatever, while Piepenbring appeals to the fact that Jahweh revealed Himself to Moses from the burning bush (Ex 3^2), and that 'He went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire' (13^{21}). But this is to confuse the essence of the God of Israel with the forms of His manifestation.

(*d*) An altogether peculiar derivation of the name יהוה has been quite recently proposed by B. Steinführer in his treatise *Untersuchung über den namen Jehovah* (1898). He says not *one* word about any previous examination of this name, but simply puts forward positively the thesis that 'the name יהוה owes its origin to the mouth of Eve. She says, "I have, making a nest, brought forth an offspring, him who causes to become"' (*den Werdewerdemacher*, p. 17). So he translates קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יהוה (Gn 4^{1b}).

(*α*) How slight his knowledge of Hebrew is one sees from the way in which he connects the verb קָנָה with קֵן, 'nest,' which comes from קָנַן.

(*β*) He takes the אֵת of Gn 4^{1b} again as the sign of the accusative. I have shown in the *Expositor* (March 1898, p. 205 ff.) that this אֵת has analogies in Gn 49^{25a}, Jg 8^{7b}, Est 9^{29}, and hence may be taken, with all the versions, as the אֵת of accompaniment, alliance, help (cf. my *Syntax*, § 288 p). Since then, Marti (in the *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1897, p. 641) has proposed to read *ōth*, and would translate 'a bearer of the Jahweh sign.' But granting that *ōth Jahweh* might be translated 'a sign of Jahweh,' the suggestion of Marti cannot be approved, because there is no previous allusion to such a sign. Thus there is properly no trace in tradition of this word *ōth* having been read here. Further, M. Lambert (in the *Revue des Études juives*, 1898, p. 102) thinks that the אֶת־יהוה of Gn 4^{1b} owed its origin to a 'dittographie verticale.' He believes he has discovered this species of copyist's error in Gn 40^{13} 45^7, Nu 25^8, 2 K 7^{18}, Jer 3^{17} 8^3 10^3 16^{17} 22^{15}, Ezk 16^4 35^4, Ps $39^{6f.}$, Est 11 (?)^{26}, and he does not consider it too bold to see in the two words אֶת־יהוה of Gn 4^{1b} the result of such a false repetition. He remarks, 'les mots n'ajoutent rien à l'étymologie du nom de Caïn et n'offrent pas de sens satisfaisant. Un copiste n'aurait-il pas, par inadvertance, reproduit les mots את חוה de la ligne précédente, et חוה n'est-il pas devenu ensuite le tétragramme?' But the two grounds he adduces are insufficient to justify such an assumption. Moreover, a 'sens satisfaisant' for the two words is established by the parallels collected by me.

(*γ*) יהוה is, according to Steinführer, to be read as fut. Piel, and consequently to be pronounced *Yehawweh* (pp. 5, 17). This is, in the first place, unnecessary. For if a form with a causative sense ('he who causes to exist') were to be sought, the Hiphil *yahweh* could be chosen, and this form would correspond with Theodoret's Ἰαβέ. The pronunciation *Yehawweh* is further improbable, because nowhere else do we meet with a Piel of הוה or היה. Steinführer further identifies the יהוה of Gn 4^{1b} with the הוא of 3^{15b}. This view was favoured by some earlier theologians, but it is criticised by me in the *Expositor* (March, 1898, p. 209 f.). Nor has Steinführer adduced any plausible arguments in favour of this exegesis. On the contrary, he contradicts himself. For he translates (p. 17), 'ich habe hervorgebracht einen Mann,' and yet he adds on p. 18, 'dieser Lebensbringer soll erst kommen.' Finally, he himself expresses the opinion that 'in the words of Eve there is so much false that it is readily perceived that this offspring is not the seed [the זֶרַע of 3^{15b}].' But the words attributed to Eve in 4^{1b} contain something false only if, with Steinführer, one falsely sees in את יהוה the accusative, an apposition to אִישׁ, 'a man.' But they contain a very natural expression of grateful joy, if one renders *eth Jahweh*, with the ancient Versions, by 'with (the alliance, the help of) Jahweh' (A.V. 'from the LORD').

ED. KÖNIG.

Rostock.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is in the November number of the *Biblical World* a curious short exegetical article which deserves a moment's attention. The writer is one of the greatest critics of the New Testament text that have ever lived—Professor Caspar René Gregory of Leipzig. And it cannot be entirely without significance that he makes the seemingly accidental reading of one old manuscript the occasion for a new and striking interpretation of a most familiar narrative.

It is the narrative of the woman taken in adultery. Jesus had spent the night in some rude hut or under the shade of an olive tree. In the morning He came into the temple. He was about to address the multitude, assembled there already in the early morning, when there arose a stir at the gate. Scribes and Pharisees drew nearer than was their wont. They brought with them a woman taken in adultery,—in the very act, they added with manly frankness,—and they demanded of Jesus what they should do with her. 'Moses said, Stone her, but what sayest Thou?' Jesus was not likely to say, 'Stone her.' It is testimony to the impression His gentleness had made even on the Scribes and Pharisees. But will He dare to contradict Moses and bid them let her go?

Jesus stooped down, and with His finger wrote upon the ground. They did not read the writing. They were watching his apparent embarrassment, and scenting immediate victory. He lifted up His eyes for a moment. 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her,' He said. And He stooped down, and went on with His writing on the ground. 'They were convicted in their own conscience,' explained some early commentator; and our Received Text has accepted the explanation. Dr. Gregory does not receive it. They were only more exultant now. 'Without sin? Of course we are without sin. Are we not the Scribes and Pharisees who know the Law and need no repentance? This will not do. He cannot answer. He is caught.'

But Jesus was still writing on the ground. And now the near bystanders had begun to look at the writing. By a sudden flash of suspicion, or a sudden glitter of his name on the sand, the oldest of the Pharisees bent his head and read. His name was Eldad. 'Eldad stole a house from Joram's widow.' He turned without a word and went out. Nahum was next in order. He stepped into Eldad's place, and was close to the Writer's finger. 'Nahum slew Azidad in the desert.' The long past deed rushed back. He saw the staff flash again in the sun as he brought it down on his friend's shoulder when there was no eye to see. He turned and passed out without a word. Jesus wrote on. One by one the Pharisees took the place of the one who last went out and read their

sentence. 'And they, *when they read it*, went out one by one, beginning from the eldest even to the last; and Jesus was left alone, and the woman in the midst.'

Next to the birth and the resurrection of our Lord, the most outstanding miraculous fact in early Christianity is the conversion of St. Paul. That it is a fact no one has for a long time come forward to deny. That it is a miraculous fact, however, is still denied by many. The latest is Dr. Orello Cone.

Dr. Cone has published a new Life of St. Paul, through Messrs. A. & C. Black in this country. He calls his book *Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher* (8vo, pp. 475, 10s. 6d.). Its peculiarity is that it describes the apostle from his own letters. The Book of Acts is not made use of. Dr. Cone does not think the Book of Acts is worth making use of. If we would seek reliable facts we must go for them to the six genuine Epistles, which are Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philippians. The rest is not reliable.

Whereupon we find that the latest method of handling the miraculous in the conversion of St. Paul is to show that it is not miraculous according to the six genuine Epistles. 'If the Church,' says Dr. Cone, 'had never had the accounts of Paul's conversion in Acts, which show how the event was regarded a half-century or so after it happened, and how tradition had given the occurrence a legendary form and embellishment, no one would have thought of resorting to a miracle to explain it.'

We at once recall the statement, 'And last of all, as unto one born out of due time, He appeared to me also,' in 1 Co 15^{8}, which is one of the six genuine Epistles. But Dr. Cone is ready to remind us of it, and his answer is that it does not refer to St. Paul's conversion. In Gal 1^{16}, another of the genuine Epistles, is the statement that 'it pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me,' and the apostle immediately adds, 'that I might preach Him among the Gentiles.' Dr. Orello Cone says that the conversion and the separation to the Gentile mission were two distinct events in the apostle's history. And as the passage in Galatians plainly refers to the Gentile mission, the passage in 1 Corinthians refers to the Gentile mission also.

Thus Dr. Cone makes the conversion of St. Paul an unmiraculous and, it must be added, an unrecorded event. The Epistles do not mention it, the Book of Acts deserves no credit. But has he done away with the miraculous? He has only removed it a step forward. Even in the Epistles St. Paul says that the Lord appeared to him after His resurrection, and that it pleased God to reveal His Son in him. The references may be to the Gentile mission and not to the conversion, but are they not miraculous?

Dr. Cone sees the difficulty. But he has nothing to offer beyond the old story of 'abnormal physico-psychological phenomena.' Since certain other revelations which the apostle had 'were received during a suspension of his normal consciousness,'—Dr. Cone refers to the 'visions and revelations of the Lord' of 2 Co 12^{1-4},—this was the case also whenever he tells us that he had 'seen' the Lord. And then he says that these visions and revelations were really nothing more than a conviction borne in upon the apostle's mind. Thus it comes about that the sight of the Risen Redeemer, which St. Paul places on a level with His appearances to St. Peter and the Twelve, was simply 'an inward manifestation, a conviction, which left the matter beyond all question that Jesus was the Son of God and the Saviour.'

The missing link has been found. Last August Professor Ernst Haeckel of Jena came to Cambridge to deliver a lecture at the Fourth International Congress of Zoology. He gave his lecture the unpretentious title of 'Our Present

Knowledge of the Descent of Man.' But it has now been published. It has been published by Messrs. A. & C. Black, with notes by Dr. Gadow, which make it into a volume. And it has received the title of *The Last Link*.

For there was but one link wanting to the proof of man's descent from the monkey, and it has been found. It was to tell us that it had been found that Professor Haeckel came to Cambridge. It is to assure us that it has been found that Professor Haeckel's Lecture is now published. Dr. Gadow is strictly accurate in his title. It is evidently a matter of much interest to zoology. Who will say that it is a matter of no interest whatever to theology?

Before the last link was discovered there were certain facts established as to the descent of man. Professor Haeckel counted them established, and he enumerates them in this way. The Primates, being the highest order of mammals, form one natural, monophyletic group; and from their common ancestor—from the hypothetical Archiprimas—have descended all the Lemures, Simiæ, and Homines. Of these the Lemures are the oldest, and the Simiæ or Apes next. The Simiæ are divided into two groups, and these two groups differ so greatly that Professor Haeckel thinks well of Hartmann's startling classification: first, man and the Anthropomorphæ, or tailless apes; second, all the other monkeys. In any case, it is to the one group of monkeys, called scientifically the Catarrhinæ, or close-nostrilled, that man is allied. In short, it had been shown that man is descended directly from Catarrhine ancestors. The very species had not been found. It has been found at last.

Not the whole species of course. Unfortunately not even a complete individual of the species. Only the skull-cap, a femur, and two teeth. And these portions have been the subject of the keenest dispute. It has even been denied by very high authority that they all belong to one individual. But Professor Haeckel does not doubt that they belong to one and the same individual. He believes that that individual was neither a monkey nor a man, but just between the two. He is thoroughly convinced that the *Pithecanthropus erectus*, the name given to the species to which the skull-cap, femur, and two teeth belong, is the long-sought missing link.

It was in 1894 and in Java that the missing link was discovered. When the International Zoological Congress met at Leyden, in 1895, every subject of discussion was dwarfed by the interest of Dr. Eugène Dubois and his new-found fossils. Professor Virchow disbelieved. He held that the skull belonged to an ape, while the thigh belonged to a man. The discussion was warm and long. At last, twelve experts were set apart to examine the fossils and report. Three reported that they came from a low race of men; three that they were the bones of a man-like ape of great size; the rest maintained that they belonged to an intermediate form, which directly connected primitive man with the anthropoid apes. And Professor Haeckel has no hesitation in saying that 'this last view is the right one.' Professor Haeckel is quite sure that '*Pithecanthropus erectus* is the long-searched-for missing link.'

Audi alteram partem. It is the most useful instruction a man can give. But he must follow it himself. Where is the divine so good as follow his own instruction here? Dr. Sanday of Oxford is that divine.

Dr. Sanday has published, through Messrs. Longmans, a volume of sermons to the times. He has given his volume the general title of *The Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England* (crown 8vo, pp. 128, 3s. 6d.). He has given it this title because he knows that round the conception of priesthood the great religious conflict of the present century is raging. Other issues occasionally appear, other

controversies, as that of ritual, sometimes raise a cloud. But Dr. Sanday sees no vital question in ritual. 'Tastes differ largely,' he says, 'as to the extent to which they would choose to have ideas presented to the eye and to the ear as well as to the mind. But if the ideas that underlie the presentation are not harmful, the mode of presentation does not make them harmful.' It is not ritual less or more; it is not even the right of one person and not another to use the ritual; it is whether or not that ritual includes a sacrificial offering.

There are four sermons in Dr. Sanday's volume. In the first he discourses on the unity of the Church, and says memorable things in his own impressive way. In the last, he pleads for patience in the present stress. Even the second, which traces the origin and early history of the Christian ministry, is subordinate. The third, with its title, the single word 'Sacerdotalism,' contains the beating heart of the book. Its first sentence opens the whole matter: 'I suppose that the deepest cleavage at the present moment in the Church of England is that between those who hold and those who deny the priestly character of the ministry.' We shall touch on that sermon only.

In the second sermon Professor Sanday has shown that the controversy as to the origin of the Christian ministry is best represented by two champions, the late Dr. Hort and Dr. Moberly. The controversy regarding the priesthood is between Dr. Moberly and Bishop Lightfoot. And Dr. Sanday shows, first of all, that when Bishop Lightfoot spoke of the minister as priest, he had in mind the sacrificial priesthood of the Old Testament. The minister of the New Testament, said Bishop Lightfoot, is not a priest in that sense. And Dr. Sanday believes that Dr. Moberly would agree. Dr. Moberly holds that the minister of the New Testament is a priest, and a sacrificing priest, but not such a sacrificing priest as we find in the Old Testament.

That being so, the controversy between Dr. Moberly and Bishop Lightfoot may be mainly one of words. Dr. Sanday believes that it is. But we may say at once that we doubt it. What does Dr. Moberly mean by a sacrificing priesthood?

Dr. Moberly says that Christ's offering of Himself to the Father was an act of sacrifice. Rather, to make a distinction familiar at least to Presbyterians, it was a sacrificial *work*. For it was accomplished not by His death only, but by the whole earthly life of which the death was the last element. The death was necessary, for 'without shedding of blood there is no remission'; but it was only the necessary culmination of the sacrifice which covered the whole earthly life. But what Christ does, the Church does. We are crucified with Christ. We offer ourselves a living sacrifice every day of our lives. And if the Church does it, then especially the ministry, who are its executive organs, do it. And the New Covenant has its sacrificial system as well as the Old.

Dr. Sanday illustrates by means of the passage which he has chosen for his text. Let us follow his exposition of it. The passage is Ro $15^{15.16}$. St. Paul is apologizing to the Roman Christians for his boldness in urging upon them their duties. But he tells them that he is urging nothing new, and even in recalling to their minds what they already know, he does it in virtue of the apostleship to the Gentiles which has been committed to him. 'I write,' he says, 'because of the grace that was given me of God, that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles' (λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη—I need not remind you, adds Dr. Sanday, that λειτουργόν is exactly the word that would be used of the discharge of the priests' office in the temple), 'ministering the gospel of God' (the R.V. notes in the margin that the Greek is 'ministering in sacrifice'—the word is ἱερουργοῦντα, the technical term for the function of sacrifice), 'that the offering up of the Gentiles' (ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν, that is, not the offering which the Gentiles *make*, but which the Gentiles

are) 'might be made acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.' Dr. Sanday continues: 'The apostle conceives of himself as standing at the altar; and the offering which he lays upon the altar is the Gentile Church, so far as it is of his founding, or comes within his special province. An offering ought to be without blemish. It ought to be first purified before it is offered. And it is the apostle's earnest prayer to God, that these converts of his, these Gentile Churches for which he is responsible, may be so sanctified by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon them that they may be an offering really acceptable, a sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savour, for the purpose for which they are destined.'

Now, if this is what Dr. Moberly means by the sacrifice of the New Testament altar, and if this is all that he means, there is no doubt that between Bishop Lightfoot and him — as between any Christian whatever and him—there is no controversy. The only question that could arise is over the name of the Christian minister. If the minister is called priest, simply because he is the instrument through whom his people are enabled to crucify the flesh, and live and die to God; if he is priest because he is a true pastor, and offers his flock to God, as Christ offered His earthly life, on the altar of obedience, who will cry out against the name of priest? It may be taken from another office to express this one, and so give rise to misunderstanding. On that account it may be pronounced a mistake. But it is in itself an inoffensive word, and it expresses not only an inoffensive, but a most commendable office.

That Dr. Moberly holds the pastoral office in high esteem is made abundantly evident. He would have the priest to offer his people so. But when the priest has laid his people in spotless acceptance upon God's altar, he has not done the work that gives him the name of priest. Dr. Sanday acknowledges that that is only the half of Dr. Moberly's meaning. Is it even an essential part of his meaning? Is not the sacrifice which Dr. Moberly's priest offers upon the altar a *propitiatory* sacrifice? If it is, it can be neither the person of the offerer, nor the persons of his flock. It must be the person of Christ.

Now Dr. Sanday does not believe that even the very 'highest' among the clergy of the Church of England understand that in offering Christ in the Eucharist they are repeating the sacrifice of Calvary. That act is done, he says, once for all, and cannot possibly need to be repeated. But there is an offering ever being made in heaven. As the shedding of blood in the levitical sacrifice was only the preliminary to the sacrifice being laid upon the altar, so, says Dr. Moberly, Calvary is only the preliminary, though the indispensable preliminary, to 'the eternal self-presentation in heaven of the risen and ascended Lord.' But what Christ is in heaven, the Church, which is His body, is upon the earth. What He does eternally she must do eternally also. If He makes an eternal offering of Himself in heaven before the presence, and on the throne, of God, she on earth makes the same offering on the altar of the New Covenant. To leave Dr. Sanday for a moment longer, and quote Dr. Moberly exactly: 'Christ Himself has prescribed for all time an outward ceremonial, which is the symbolic counterpart in the Church on earth, not simply of Calvary, but of that eternal presentation of Himself in heaven in which Calvary is vitally contained. Through this symbolic enactment, rightly understood,—an enactment founded on, and intrinsically implying, as well as recalling, Calvary,—she in her eucharistic worship on earth is identified with His sacrificial self-oblation to the Father; she is transfigured up into the scene of the unceasing commemoration of His sacrifice in heaven; or the scene of His eternal offering in heaven is translated down to, and presented, and realized in the worship on earth.'

This is the controversy between Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Moberly. Is it a controversy about words? If there is reality in Dr. Moberly's posi-

tion; if, as he believes, it is an intelligible idea; then it differs from the sacrifices of the Old Testament only in its victim being Christ the heavenly Lamb instead of bulls and goats, and Bishop Lightfoot was surely aware of that distinction. However nebulous it may be to others, however mystical to Dr. Moberly himself, it is intended to be regarded as a real sacrifice, and the priest who offers it on earth is a real sacrificing priest. There is probably not another point in all the line of controversy where Dr. Sanday has failed to draw the controversy nearer a conclusion. But this is the point of hottest conflict, and we fear he has failed completely here.

Dr. G. A. Smith's Biography of Drummond is short enough and of interest enough to be read right through; all its readers will read it right through. And then they will find that they are just where they were when they began. There is not a new fact; there is not a new impression. The puzzle of Drummond's life is a puzzle still.

The puzzle is that he gave his life to evangelistic work, that he associated with evangelistic people, and evangelistic people, with a single heroic—we hesitated, after reading the Biography, if quixotic was not the word—evangelistic people, with a single heroic exception, hated him.

Who can explain this? Not we. All we can do is to set down the explanation which Professor Smith's Biography seems to give, though it is incredible that it should be true. Professor Smith's Biography seems to say that it was because Drummond never was suddenly converted. Do not laugh. Sudden conversion was a fact in Drummond's methods as in the methods of all the evangelistic people he worked with. 'Once when talking of sudden conversions, I asked Drummond whether he had passed through one. "No," he said, after thinking for a little; "I cannot say I did. But," he added, "I have seen too many ever to doubt their reality."'

He had seen too many ever to doubt their reality. He believed in them up to that. But he had not passed through one, so he did not believe in their necessity. Now an evangelistic preacher preaches his necessary beliefs—that is to say, his experiences. At first Drummond preached Moody's experiences, and so the necessity of sudden conversion. But when he came to preach his own, he did not preach the necessity of sudden conversion, he did not preach the fact.

For in sudden conversion the indispensable and moving agent is the Holy Spirit. So all the evangelistic people preach. But so did not Drummond. 'You ask what it is, this coming to Christ,' he said to the Edinburgh students. 'Well, what does Jesus Himself tell you here? He says, Learn of Me. Now, you are all learners, you have come to Edinburgh, some of you from the ends of the earth, to learn. And how did you put yourself in the way of learning what is here taught? You went to the university office and wrote your name in a book, you matriculated; and, becoming a university student, you went to get from each individual professor what he had to teach. So, with definite purpose to learn of Christ, must you come to Him and surrender yourself to His teaching and guidance.'

It was his own way. When he found himself as a preacher, he could do none other than preach his own experience. And the Holy Spirit was not in it. Then he went further. He denied the necessity of the Holy Spirit. If a man is lost, none but the Holy Spirit can find him. But if he is only sunk, another man may lift him up. 'There are two ways,' he said, 'in which men who offer their lives to their fellow-men may regard the world. The first view is that the world is lost and must be saved; the second, that the world is sunken and must be raised. I shall now speak from the last standpoint.'

So Moody stood by him, but by and by the evangelistic people would have none of him.

'The story goes that a deputation of the usual adherents of Northfield Conference waited on Mr. Moody and urged him not to allow Drummond to speak. Mr. Moody asked a day to think over the matter; and when the deputation returned, informed them that he had laid it before the Lord, and the Lord had shown him that Drummond was a better man than himself; so he was to go on.' But Drummond came to Northfield, and the word which he wrote after he left is, 'At Northfield I felt a good deal out of it, and many fell upon me and rent me. It was not a happy time.'

The Incarnation and the Inner Life.

By the Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester.

'Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.'—1 John iv. 2.

Only too commonly the Incarnation is regarded as a doctrine which faith must accept, but which, except in its issues and results, has no immediate connexion with the tenor of daily life. It has been felt, even by serious thinkers, to offer but little on which the soul can meditatively rest in relation to the movements and developments of the inner life. It is, and it remains to many a good Christian, simply a holy mystery, a vital article of belief, but not a truth, like its sequel the Redemption, which seems to quicken every thanksgiving, and to give warmth to every utterance of prayer.

And yet it is plain enough from the text that to confess the Incarnation, in all its blessed fulness and reality of meaning, is to afford a proof of being a very son of God, and a recipient in fullest measure of the inworking power of the Spirit.

'Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.' Let us then, under the hallowing influence of this momentous declaration, at once humbly endeavour to realize the Incarnation, and strive to make our hearts feel it to be, as it is, one of the two great spiritual powers that, in faithful hearts, are ever felt in all the varied movements of the inner life. The power of the Incarnation and what an apostle speaks of as the power of the Lord's Resurrection are the two great powers ever working, either latently or patently, in the deeper depths of the believing heart.

But how shall we best realize this power and its manifestations? Perhaps thus. By keeping in the foreground of our thoughts two simple questions, and from the answers we give to them arriving at what this power of the Incarnation is that we are seeking to bring home to our souls.

I. The first and fundamental question is obviously this: Who is He of whose Incarnation we are speaking? The immediate and instinctively given answer that each one of us would return would probably be the one word, God. True, most true, most blessedly true, but yet not the suggestive and instructive answer which the apostle who wrote the words on which we are meditating has enabled us to make. What St. John, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, plainly reveals to us is this, that He who was Incarnate was He who was in the beginning, ever with God, and Himself God. And the name that he gives to Him is the Word; that studiously chosen term being designed to include all those higher approximations to the belief in the eternal sonship of our Lord which are to be traced in the Old Testament, and which, when St. John wrote his Gospel, were finding a more and more defined place in the higher and holier teachings of Jewish theology. To the cultivated Jew of Ephesus or Alexandria the one word *Logos*, imperfectly rendered in our language by *Word*, awakened thoughts that, probably in many and many a case, prepared the way for the reception of the gospel message, and for the soul-saving conviction that He who in bygone days had spoken by the prophets was now speaking by His Son. And not to the Jew only did that mysteriously chosen term bear its awakening and life-giving thoughts. How it discloses to each one of us, as the apostle

defines more closely all that he designed to convey to us by his use of the term, that our dear Lord and Master was in the world from the beginning, that He was the light of the world when its foundations were laid, and that through Him Divine life streamed forth into every realm of creation.

Nay, more, we seem permitted to believe that when man was called into being through the love of God on the earth which was prepared for him, the Word, the Eternal Son, was, so to speak, the mediating actor between the Father and the first human pair, even before sin and disobedience had cast them forth from the paradise of their primal innocence. It is not a wild thought that has been often entertained by many a holy and devout thinker, that, so close has ever been the bond between the Word and the children of His hand, that even if man had not sinned, the Son would still have vouchsafed to take upon Him man's nature, that He might Himself lead the creature of His hand to the highest stage of conceivable perfection.

In a word, we are not constrained to believe that the crowning manifestation of Divine love, the Incarnation of the Eternal Son, was brought about by, and resulted from, the circumstances of man's disobedience. The form under which the Incarnation actually took place, the lowliness and humility of its circumstances, may have been, as it were, necessitated by man's lost estate and fallen condition, but the Incarnation in itself, every deeper thought seems to tell us, must have resulted from the infinite love of the Creator for the creatures of His hand. With such thoughts in our hearts, with what impressiveness and solemnity do the opening words of St. John's Gospel fall on our ears: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.'

II. But we may now pass onward to the second of the two questions to which, as I said, we will attempt to give an answer in this sermon. The answer to the first question, simple and almost unnecessary as the question may have seemed to be, has led us into some deep, but, as I hope, not unprofitable thoughts. It has led us to feel that the union of man with our Mediator, and (after the Fall) our Saviour and our Redeemer, has ever existed since man has been called into being; and that the Incarnation even in its present form is a manifestation not merely of a pitying love for a fallen race, but of a love which called our race into existence, and has loved it from all time, and will love it even to the end.

Such thoughts seem to bring the holy mystery of this day home to our very inmost souls. The love of the Word for each one of us, for each member of the human family, is a love that verily passes all understanding.

But why, we may now ask as our second question, why was this love manifested in a form so startling in its lowliness as that which is revealed to us in the gospel narrative? Could not the Word have become flesh—could not the Incarnation have been a true and real entry into our humanity and a veritable assumption of our nature without the humble birth, the slow, silent years of growth, and the gradual increase of wisdom and experience? Though such questions *will* arise in the soul, there is a kind of presumption in entertaining them, and, to some extent, in endeavouring to answer them. This, however, may with all reverence be said, that, had it been otherwise, the conviction that the Son of God had verily and truly taken our nature upon Him would never have been felt with completeness and fulness in the human heart. The earliest, perhaps, of all the heresies that showed itself in the Church, the persuasion that our Lord had a body merely in appearance, disclose plainly to us a tendency in the ever-doubting heart of man which never could have been resisted had not the Eternal Son in His infinite mercy and compassion vouchsafed to be born as we are born, and to pass through all the stages of human growth and development.

Verily, when we are striving, as we now are striving, to bring home to the soul all the plenitudes of blessings that are vouchsafed to us in our inner life by the Incarnation of the Eternal Son, this blessing must ever stand in the foreground, that the associated circumstances go far to confirm the truth and reality of the event. So far, indeed, that it may be fairly said that doubt in the reality of our dear Lord's assumption of our nature can never be entertained with any show of reason, unless we reject altogether the written word of the gospel.

But though this we may humbly presume to be the primary purpose of the form and manner in which the Word vouchsafed to become flesh, and to dwell as He did dwell among the children of

men, yet this was not by any means the only purpose of that mystery of humility on which we are now meditating. Does not the Incarnation with all its attendant circumstances bring home to us the vital truth that if such was the form and manner of the Lord's assumption of our humanity, communion with Him here and hereafter must be a blessed reality on which the loving and believing soul may rely with the most unchanging confidence?

If the dear Lord while here on earth verily did live in blessed union and communion with His chosen ones, as some of that holy number tell us plainly that He did live—if the Incarnation bore with it that boundless blessing to disciples and apostles, what is there to lead us to doubt that to those that love Him and pray for His abiding presence with them, the Incarnation bears the self-same privilege and blessing now, changed only as to manifestation and visibility, but not as to power and reality? There are times when we are permitted to feel this with a mysterious vividness. In hours of deep sorrow, when all earthly consolation is, and is felt to be, powerless and unavailing, are there not some at least who can remember a consciousness of a presence, a presence of consolation and sympathy, so vivid, that there could be One and One only of whom that presence was a revealing,—our loving, pitying, and Incarnate Lord? These things are not illusions. They are results of the mystery of the Incarnation, verifications of that eternal truth that our Creator is also our sympathizing High Priest, touched with the feeling of our infirmities, because He knows those infirmities in their inmost nature, not simply by virtue of His omniscience, but by the experiences of a sinless humanity.

These are serious yet comforting thoughts. They seem to help us to feel that our dear Lord's Incarnation is not merely a holy mystery which faith must apprehend, but that it carries to the soul convictions of the personal love of Christ toward each fellow-man which make it, what it seems now becoming more and more to us all, the, so to speak, practical doctrine of our own mysteriously moving and eventful times. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man are the two great truths which, year by year, modern religious thought seems more distinctly apprehending and realizing; and that each of these great principles rests upon, as its basis, the Incarnation, may be regarded as an almost self-evident truth. The revelation of God as our Father was made to us through the Son of His love. Our revelation of the Brotherhood of man can only come through the beloved One, who made Himself our Elder Brother that He might die for us, and make us His brethren and His own for evermore.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

The New Babylonian Version of the Story of the Deluge.

Among the cuneiform tablets recently discovered in Babylonia, Dr. Scheil has found a fragment which contains a new version of the story of the Deluge, which he has published in the *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, xx. pp. 55-59. Out of the 439 lines which it originally contained only a few broken ones are preserved, but its importance lies in its antiquity. It was written by the scribe Ellit-Â in the reign of Ammi-zadoq, the fourth successor of Khammurabi or Ammurapi, the Amraphel of Genesis, and it therefore belongs to the age of Abraham.

The interest which this gives to it makes me believe that the following translation of its mutilated lines will not be unacceptable to the readers of The Expository Times. I have assumed that Dr. Scheil's copy is correct: he is a good copyist, and has had exceptional opportunities for mastering the difficulties of the early Babylonian script.

Of the first column little is left except the ends of the lines:—

1. 'He went not . . . many years.
2. . . . (the deeds) of mankind thou knowest (?).

3. . . . (like) cattle they multiply.
4. . . . the god will rain (destruction?).
5. . . . their cry.
6. . . . great.
7. . . . mankind.
8. . . . the light.
9. . . . grant (*bîna*) unto men.
10. . . . they love.
11. . . . may the god Rimmon slay.
12. Like the inundation of a river will we march.
13. . . . the water-springs (*naqbi*).
14. May he (*i.e.* Rimmon) go, may he devastate!
15. May he break up the water-springs (below)!
16. May he rain destruction (*sabêtum*) for me!
17. (On?) my . . . it has dripped.
18. . . . of the field, the herb of his land.'

Several lines are lost, and then we read in the second column :—

1. 'May he slay, may he slaughter . . .
2. At dawn may he rain destruction (upon them)!
3. At night may he break . . .
4. May he rain a deluge (upon them)!
5. As for the field he shall utterly destroy it, as for the city (he shall overthrow it)!
6. What Rimmon shall accomplish in the city (he shall also do in the field).
7. (Thus) he spake and departed with a cry (*nagigu*);
8. he made the cry ascend (to heaven).
9. They feared not . . . '

This is all that is left of the obverse; on the reverse we have portions of the seventh and eighth columns. Of the seventh column we have the following :—

1. 'Ea (?) opened his mouth,
2. He says unto me:
3. Wherefore hast thou caused men to die?
4. I will stretch forth my hand to (Adram-khasis).
5. The deluge whereof thou speakest (shall not destroy him).
6. Whoever he be, I (will save him?).
7. And he has begotten (offspring).
8. His work exists . . .
9. Let him rescue (his family?),
10. and he shall beget (children), and . . .
11. Let him go into (the ark?).
12. The oars (and) the bolts (*pirki*) (let him fashion).
13. Let him go . . . '

With the eighth column the tablet ends. Only the concluding lines are preserved :—

1. ' . . . What he did unto men.
2. Adram-khasis opened his mouth, and
3. says to his lord.
4. The second tablet of the series (beginning): When the man lay down.
5. (The number of lines) in the tablet is 439.
6. (Written) by Ellit-Â, a young scribe,
7. the 28th day of the month Sebat,
8. the year when Ammi-zaduga (Ammi-zadoq) the king,
9. the fortress of Ammi-zaduga
10. at the mouth of the Euphrates
11. constructed of brick.'

In the seventh column I have followed Dr. Scheil in making the god Ea the speaker; but if he has copied the cuneiform character correctly, it would rather represent the fire-god under the name of Urru (*W.A.I.* ii. 47. 61).

Dr Scheil believes that the tablet comes from Sippara, and that the legend inscribed on it is the version of the story that was current there. At all events, it has little in common with the version embodied in the epic of Gilgames. It belongs, in fact, to a different poem or epic. While the epic of Gilgames was known as the literary work which began with the words, 'They beheld the water-spring,' that which contained the new version of the account of the Deluge commenced with the words, 'When the man lay down.' It began, therefore, with the description of a dream, and the portion of it which is preserved seems to contain the revelations made by the gods in a dream to Adra-khasis. It is noteworthy that in the Gilgames version the fact that the revelation of Ea was conveyed to the Chaldæan Noah in a dream is mentioned only incidentally at the end of the story.

But while the new version is thus totally different from that discovered by Mr. George Smith, it has much in common with a fragment brought from Babylonia by Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, and containing what is known as 'the second version of the Deluge story.' In both the name of the Chaldæan Noah is Adra-khasis, not Khiszud as in the Gilgames text, and a similar conversation is represented as taking place between Adra-khasis and Ea. Indeed, what we read in the newly found tablet seems to be the introduction to the more specific details in regard to the construction of the ark which are given in the 'second version.' The drama is made to begin in heaven: the angry god calls upon Rimmon, the god of storm and inundation, to destroy mankind, and it is only the intervention of Ea which prevents the one righteous man and his family from perishing in the general catastrophe. The drama is eventually revealed to Adra-khasis in a dream.

Note on the Name of Sisera.

Mr. Tomkins has long since suggested that Sisera is a name of Hittite origin formed like Khattu-sar, Khilip-sar, Pi-siris, etc. I would now suggest that it be further identified with the 'Sura-'sar of the Tel el-Amarna tablets. 'Sura-'sar was governor of the Canaanitish city of [Gim]ti-asna or Gath-ashan, the Kentu-asna of the list of Thothmes III. (see my note in the *Records of the Past*, new ser. v. p. 46), which lay between Taanach and Acre.[1] We seem to have another name compounded with *sar* in that of the god Sutu-sar, invoked by the Assyrian king, Samas-Rimmon (*W.A.I.* i. 29, 18), and who is associated with a god called Nebo-rabê in an inscription published by Dr. Scheil (*Z.A.* viii. p. 206). On a seal-cylinder, also published by Dr. Scheil (*Recueil de Travaux*, xix. p. 53), Nabo-rabê is said to be the father of 'the god Laz of Gimti' or Gath. The first element in Sutu-sar may be 'Sutu or 'Bedawi,' just as the first element in Khattu-sar is 'Hittite.'

Studies in Ancient Oriental History.[2]

Professor Prášek's contributions to the study of ancient Oriental history are always welcome. He is one of the ablest and most learned of those who have devoted themselves to the subject. His criticism is always judicious, and he is always acquainted with the latest discoveries. His present contribution deals with questions which are interesting to the student, both of the Old Testament and of Herodotus.

The questions discussed in it are three:—What was the Kadytis of Herodotus, which was captured by Pharaoh Necho after he had 'overthrown the Syrians at Magdôlon'? Who was the priest-king Sethos, who, according to the Egyptian legend, destroyed the army of Sennacherib? And where was the city of Usu, which is mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions?

The Bohemian Professor comes to the conclusion that the Kadytis, whose fall followed the victory of Necho, cannot be the Kadytis of another passage of Herodotus (iii. 5), which is shown by the geographical description given of it to have been Gaza. Ashdod had already been conquered by the Egyptian kings, and the Egyptian boundary accordingly fixed north of Gaza, while the victory over 'the Syrians at Magdôlon' can hardly be anything else than the overthrow of Josiah at Megiddo. Three months after the latter event we learn, from the Books of Kings, that Necho was at Riblah; Kadytis, therefore, must have lain between Megiddo and Riblah, in the position occupied by Kadesh on the Orontes, once the southern capital of the Hittites. The city, as is shown by a contract-tablet, the translation of which has been published by Mr. Pinches in the *Records of the Past* (new ser. iv. pp. 99–101), was still flourishing in the fortieth year of Nebuchadrezzar, when its governor was a Syrian of the name of Milki-idri.

Sethos Professor Prášek believes to be Tirhakah, masquerading in an Egyptian dress. Egyptian vanity turned the negro conqueror into a native Egyptian, though the legend was forced to admit that the military and ruling classes were hostile to him. Professor Prášek, like Dr. Winckler, revives the theory of George Smith, that the campaign of Sennacherib against Hezekiah, which ended in the loss of his army, was not the campaign of 701 B.C., but a second later one, of which no record has come down to us. The annals of Sennacherib cease with the year 691 B.C.; but two fragmentary texts published by George Smith indicate that he carried on a campaign in Arabia, which must be referred to the latter part of his reign, as no mention of it is made in the annals we possess. Now the Egyptian legend of Sethos calls Sennacherib king of 'the Arabians' as well as of the Assyrians. We may infer from this that the campaign in Arabia was connected with a second campaign in Palestine, which must have fallen between 690 and 681 B.C., the year of Sennacherib's death.

Moreover, it could have been only during this latter period that Tirhakah came to the help of Hezekiah, if Professor Prášek's chronology is correct, which makes Tirhakah reign from 690 to 665 B.C. The chronology is based on Manetho, as reported by Eusebius, or rather on a combination of the number of regnal years assigned to the kings of the Ethiopian dynasty by Africanus and

[1] The letter sent by 'Sura-'sar to the Egyptian king is now at Berlin (*W. and A.*, No. 145).

[2] *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Alterthums*, ii. By J. V. Prášek. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1898.

Eusebius. Africanus and Eusebius, however, do not agree with one another; and if we accept the twelve years given by Eusebius to each of the first two kings of the dynasty, we are bound also to accept the twenty years given to Tirhakah, as well as the statement that Tirhakah was followed by a certain Ammeris for eighteen (or twelve) years. But this would altogether upset the Professor's chronological scheme.

That Tirhakah's reign, however, was reckoned by the Egyptians themselves at twenty-six years we know from an Apis-stele (No. 190) found by Mariette in the Serapeum, according to which a bull, which lived for twenty-one years, was born in the twenty-sixth year of Tirhakah, and died in the twentieth year of Psammetichus. As the reign of Psammetichus was dated from 664 B.C., Tirhakah would thus have become the recognized Pharaoh of Egypt in 691, just ten years after the campaign of Sennacherib against Hezekiah in 701 B.C. But this is difficult to reconcile with the fact that Hezekiah died in B.C. 697, after a reign of twenty-nine years. Curiously enough, Professor Prášek ignores the biblical chronology altogether, although it is much better authenticated for this period of Jewish history than the chronology of the Ethiopian dynasty in Egypt, which is complicated by the fact that its founder, Sabako, did not reign more than twelve years, while his successor, to whom a reign of twelve years is assigned, bears a different name in Manetho and on the monuments, and, so far as the latter are concerned, is merely a titular king. It is quite possible that Tirhakah was the actual ruler of the country during the greater part of the time assigned to the reign of his predecessor.

As for the hypothetical second campaign of Sennacherib in Palestine, I confess that I can see neither proof nor reason for it. A campaign against the Aribi or Arabo did not imply a campaign against Judah as well, and there is absolutely nothing in the fragments brought to light by George Smith which would favour such a view. To make this quite plain, I will give here a translation of all that is left of them:—

1. '. . . by treading down the wall . . . the [gift] of their abundant tribute [I received] . . . the city of Kapâme, the city of . . . the stronghold which is in [the land of] . . . [the qu]een of the Arabs with [her] god[s] . . . precious stones [I carried away] . . . spices and ivory (?) . . . and the kings, the eyes . . . these cities. . . .'

2. 'To the goddess Dilbat of . . . the daughter of . . . who dwelt with Hazael, king of the Arabs . . . she delivered him (*i.e.* Hazael) into the hand of Sennacherib, my grandfather, and he overthrew him. Her dwelling-place was not with the men of Arabia, she had said; to Assyria she took the road.'

The last question discussed by Professor Prášek is the site of the city of Usu, which I identified with the Hosah of Jos 19[29] some years ago. This identification is approved of by him, and he further shows convincingly that Usu was the old name of Palætyrus, the town on the mainland opposite the 'rock' of Tyre, from which insular Tyre once derived its supply of water. It was the town of which Usous was the eponymous god, to whom the Phœnicians ascribed the invention of boats, and of clothes made from the skins of animals, but it passed out of remembrance after its destruction by the Assyrians. The whole discussion is a model of archæological reasoning. I may add that the form Sazu for the name of the city, given in the British Museum edition of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, is a mistake in copying; the original has Uzu.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS iv. 9.

'And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: am I my brother's keeper?'

EXPOSITION.

'And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother?'—As God asked Adam, Where art thou? He now asks Cain, Where is thy brother? As in the former case He interested Himself in the fallen man, so here in one man as compared to the other.—DELITZSCH.

IT seems that Cain at first went away, scarcely conscious of the greatness of his crime. He had asserted his rights, had suppressed the usurpation of his privileges by the younger son, and if he had used force it was his brother's fault for resisting him. So Jacob afterwards won the birthright by subtlety, and would have paid the same fearful penalty but

for timely flight, and rich presents afterwards. But Cain could not quiet his conscience, remorse tracked his footsteps; and when in the household Abel came not, and the question was asked, Where is Abel? the voice of God repeated it in his own heart, Where is Abel *thy* brother?—brother still, and offspring of the same womb, even if too prosperous. But the strong-willed man resists. What has he to do with Abel? Is he 'his brother's keeper?'—PAYNE-SMITH.

'I know not: am I my brother's keeper?'—Cain's answer shows what terrible progress sin had made since the fall of our first parents; in their case there was timid anxious flight and excuses, here a bold lie, and unloving defiance.—DELITZSCH.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

The Story of Cain and Abel.

By the Rev. Professor H. E. Ryle, D.D.

The religious teaching conveyed by the story of Cain and Abel relates to the subjects of sin, man's fallen nature, and the attitude of the Almighty towards the sinner.

1. As to sin, it teaches that the propensity to it is transmitted from one generation to another. The sin of Adam and Eve is followed by that of Cain; disobedience to God by violation of human brotherhood. The rejection of God's love leads to the renunciation of human affection. There was no love to God, no willingness to listen to the Divine voice, in Cain. The occasion of the sacrifice is the temptation by which his character is tested. Self-will, pride, jealousy, are the steps by which the thought of deliberate murder is reached. Cain becomes the archetype of sin, and the antithesis of the character of Christ (cf. 1 Jn $3^{15.16}$). According to Israelite theology he personified the action of sin in human society. Hatred against fellow-men is the fruit of rebellion against God (1 Jn $3^{11.12}$). Worship offers no safeguard against temptation. An act of sacrifice had no restraining influence over the murderous intention. Here we find an anticipation of the condemnation pronounced on those who sought to honour God with the lip though the heart was far from Him (cf. Is 29^{13}, Mk 7^{6}).

2. As regards human nature, the picture of Cain and Abel portrays the opposition subsisting from the first between good and evil, faith and self-will, obedience and lawlessness. Two brothers, brought up in the same family, engaged in the same act of worship, become the types, the one of sin, the other of righteousness (cf. Heb 11^{4}). The approach to God in the rite of sacrifice was in Abel's case no mere outward form, but the true expression of his heart's desire to draw near to God. This was true 'righteousness'; and thus 'the blood of righteous Abel' stands at the head of the roll of martyrs (Mt 23^{35}). Thus 'righteous Abel' became a type of the true Israel, of the prophets who witnessed for Jehovah against their countrymen, and, in the highest sense, of the Suffering Servant, who was Himself a sacrifice for sin. For as the preference shown to Abel's sacrifice evoked Cain's murderous resolve, so the manifestation of perfect purity and innocence 'convicted the world in respect of sin.' Abel's death strikes a prophetic note of warning. It proclaims the great opposition of which we find the climax in Jn 1^{11}: 'He came unto His own, and they that were His own received Him not.' And we turn instinctively to another message of encouragement amid suffering, 'If ye were of the world, the world would love its own,' etc (cf. whole passage, Jn 15^{18-24}).

Again, the story teaches that God left not Himself without witness, even with those who had estranged themselves from Him. The words spoken to Cain were the Divine witness, reminding us of the spiritual office of conscience, to the heart given up to sin. If Cain hears rebuke, he receives also both exhortation and promise. But he is a free agent, under no compulsion to obey God. His sin is the outcome of the abuse of that free-will, the Divine gift of which he has received by inheritance from the first parents.

Not least the narrative teaches the interdependency of the human race, the obligations we are under the one to the other.

3. As regards God, the narrative presents Him as long-suffering towards the sinner, as well as compassionate towards the innocent sufferer. He who arraigns Cain for the crime, had, before its commission, warned him of his fault, and urged him to well-doing. Nothing is hid from Him. It is not for the faithlessly offered sacrifice, but for the unseen passion of Cain's heart that God calls him to reason. The sin is no sooner committed than it comes under judgment. The punishment is heavier than that of Adam and Eve. But the judgment is tempered with compassion. He is assured of protection from blood-revenge. The favour of a token for good is granted to the first

murderer; and symbolism is consecrated, in its earliest use, to hold a pledge of Divine love before the sinner's eyes.

II.

The Obligations of Human Brotherhood.

By the Rev. H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L.

This is the earliest utterance which expresses the relation of indifference or hostility between man and man which was one of the results of the Fall. Adam could not transmit that righteousness which he had forfeited by his sin, and man, left to the animal instinct of uncontrolled nature, became estranged from God and his fellow-man. As his higher intelligence was obscured, his affections were contracted. Self-preservation and assertion absorbed the energies due to the honour of his Maker and the care of his brethren. Had Adam never fallen, all the members of the human family might have been united in affection. But the withdrawal of supernatural grace at the Fall meant the insurgence of selfish passion, and the blood of Abel and question of Cain mark the new relations between man and man.

1. Cain's question represents the spirit of the old heathen world. Every nation, tribe, class lived for itself. Self-interest was the only bond which kept them together. Even religion, which by love of a common Father in heaven, should unite those divided by race or prejudice—even religion, when it had degenerated into polytheism, accentuated the divisions of the human family. Every country had its own religion, and a national god was not responsible for—if indeed he could do anything—beyond the frontiers of his worshippers. So Benhadad's advisers urged an engagement with the forces of Israel in the plain, since they imagined that the power of the God of Israel was confined to the hills; and this difficulty of conceiving of a deity with more than a local or national sway led the heathen philosopher Celsus to say that a man must be mad who could suppose that Greeks and barbarians, Europeans and Asiatics and Africans, could ever be united in the same religion. Thus paganism did nothing to restore fellowship among men. The only efforts made to bring men together in the ancient world were made by conquest, and not based on the duty of man to man. The ancient world was a world without love. It made much of liberality, but it lacked charity. Men gave generously to the State, to their birthplace, their friends, or fellow-citizens. They constructed public works or distributed corn. But when Christian charity thinks of the recipient, pagan liberality thought of the giver, of political end or ambitions. Charity is at bottom self-denying—liberality was self-seeking. Large sums were distributed, but very little done for the sick or destitute, unless some great calamity called forth exceptional efforts.

2. It was the Mosaic law which first said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'; and 'the stranger which dwelleth among you shall be as one born among you. Thou shalt love him as thyself.' The picture of a good man in the Psalms generally insists on this side of human duty. Job is called 'a father of the poor.' The Proverbs tell us that he that hath mercy on the poor honoureth God. The Prophets contain passages quite foreign to the spirit of paganism. Thus Isaiah says, 'Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?' But a narrow feeling of nationality set in after the Captivity. The later Jew answered the question, Who is my neighbour? in the narrowest sense. He even excluded the Samaritan. Charity became formal and restricted. The Talmud said that alms should neither be given to, nor accepted from, the heathen, since they were not entitled to kindness or compassion.

3. If our Lord had not come among us, the obligations of human brotherhood would have been repudiated to the end. He might have said, 'Am I the keeper of a corrupt and rebellious race?' He might have chosen to remain in the glory which He had with the Father before the world was. But He came to be born, to obey, to suffer and die; to take on Himself all the humiliations and sorrows, crimes and degradations, of man's fallen estate. He made Himself the Keeper and Saviour of humanity. Sinners see in Him their representative and propitiation before the awful purity of God, and His blood has a significance which they cannot mistake. Abel's blood recalls the word of the murderer; the blood of

Jesus is that of the Shepherd of souls, dying of His free-will, not only for His brethren, but for His enemies.

And this event is the turning-point in the history of the moral education of the human race. Beneath His cross we understand, at length, how He would have construed Cain's phrase 'my brother.' They are everywhere our brethren, because He, our Elder Brother, died for all. Not only the respectable and the civilized, but the outcast and the savage, all have been objects of that world-embracing guardianship, and in some sense each of us, like the Divine Redeemer, is his brother's keeper.

Illustrations.

This is the very gospel of selfishness, and a murderer is its first preacher. Nowadays it is preached in various forms, not by murderers, but by those who seek the good of their kind. The gospel of selfishness is, that man must take care of his own interests; and out of that universal self-seeking, provided it be wise and restrained, will come the well-being of all. The gospel of God is of a different tone —'Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one as we are. . . . And for their sakes I sanctify Myself [offer Myself] that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' Christ regarded men as given into His hand for safe keeping. And to make them holy and at peace with God, He consecrated, or, as we read, sanctified Himself upon the cross; and so departed, leaving them this new commandment, binding them for ever, that as He had loved them, so they were to love one another.—W. Thomson.

That there is an almost shoreless sea of misery around us, which rolls up its dark waves to our very doors; that thousands live and die in the dim borderland of destitution; that little children wail and starve and perish, and soak and blacken soul and sense, in our streets; that there are hundreds and thousands of the unemployed, not all of whom, as some would persuade us, are lazy impostors; that the demon of drink still causes among us daily horrors which would disgrace Dahomey or Ashantee, and rakes into his coffers millions of pounds which are wet with tears and red with blood: these are facts patent to every eye. Now, God will work no miracle to mend these miseries. If we neglect them, they will be left uncured; but He will hold us responsible for the neglect. It is vain for us to ask, 'Am I my brother's keeper?'—F. W. Farrar.

A writer in one of the English reviews relates that during a conversation with George Eliot, not long before her death, a vase toppled over on the mantelpiece. The great writer quickly and unconsciously put out her hand to stop its fall. 'I hope,' said she, replacing it, 'that the time will come when we shall instinctively hold up the man or woman who begins to fall as naturally and unconsciously as we arrest a falling piece of furniture or an ornament.'

'Two things a master commits to his servant's care,' saith one—'the child and the child's clothes.' It will be a poor excuse for the servant to say at his master's return, 'Sir, here are all the child's clothes neat and clean, but the child is lost.' Much so with the account that many will give to God of their souls and bodies at the great day.—Flavel.

It is in the destroying the image of God that lies the essence of murder: that is the peculiar characteristic of the crime which makes it the horrible thing that it is. And if that be so, then it follows that whoever destroys the image of God in the soul of another is marked with the brand of Cain. The image of God is stamped upon every soul born into the world. That image is, since the Fall, marred and defaced, it is true; but still it is there. The work of God the Holy Ghost is the restoration of that image, the bringing it out more and more brightly, clearly, and distinctly. Ah! then the question, looked at from this point of view, becomes invested with a meaning of terrible importance—Where is Abel, thy brother? What have I done to help forward that work of the restoration of the image of God in the soul of my brother? Have I done anything to hinder that work, or to obscure that image.—W. C. Ingram.

Then Christ sought out an artizan,
A low-browed, stunted, haggard man,
And a motherless girl whose fingers thin
Pushed from her faintly want and sin.
These led He in the midst of them,
And as they drew back their garments' hem
For fear of defilement, 'Lo! here,' said He,
'The images ye have made of Me.'—Lowell.

Sermons for Reference.

Alford (H.), Sermons, 1.
Bersier (E.), Sermons, i. 3.
Brooks (G.), Five Hundred Outlines, 277.
Cumming (J.), Church before the Flood, 186.
Dover (T. B.), Lent Manual, 5.
Farrar (F. W.), Sermons (Contemp. Pub.), 1.
Goodwin (H.), Parish Sermons, iv. 272.
Hathaway (E. P.), Ten Commandments and Lord's Prayer, 83.
Ingram (W. C.), Happiness in the Spiritual Life, 228.
Liddon (H. P.), Sermons, ii. 1.
Melvill (H.), Sermons on Less Prominent Facts, 286.
Sinclair (W.), Christ and Our Times, 297.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xxiv. No. 1399.
Thomson (W.), Life in the Light of God's Word, 200.

The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual.

By Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Aberdeen.

XV. The Power of God.

The power of the god or goddess is often extolled: [εὐλογοῦντες? τὰ]ς [δ]υνάμ(ε)ις (*Athen. Mittheil.*, 1881, p. 273),[1] or ε(ὐ)λογῶν σου τὰς δυνάμ(ε)ις, or δυνατῇ θεῷ εὐχαριστῶ Λητῷ. The threat is used, he who is disobedient ἀναγνώσεται τὰς δυνάμ[ε]ις τοῦ Διός (Le Bas-Waddington, No. 668).

The plural δυνάμεις is used in all these cases: it indicates, as is common with the plural of abstract nouns (especially in Latin), instances in which δύναμις is shown, *i.e.* 'marvellous works.' In the example last quoted, 'he that is disobedient shall recognize the marvellous acts of Zeus.' The thought corresponds to the Mohammedan saying 'Mash-allah! (what God wills!)' an exclamation of surprise at anything remarkable, or great, or excellent.

Both singular and plural are used in the New Testament: μὴ εἰδότες τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, Mt 22^{29}; δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν, Lk 5^{17}; and δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχούσας ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίει, Ac 19^{11}.

The god or goddess is the powerful one: δυνατῇ θεῷ εὐχαριστῶ Λητῷ (comp. Ro 11^{23}, δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός; He 11^{19}, δυνατὸς ὁ Θεός). Leto makes things possible that were impossible, *e.g.* ἐξ ἀδυνάτων δυνατὰ π(οι)εῖ (*C.B.*, No. 53; comp. Mk 10^{27}, Mt 19^{26}, παρὰ Θεῷ πάντα δυνατά); Lk 18^{27}, τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἐστίν.

One of the most remarkable of all the hieratic inscriptions is now in the Boston Fine Art Museum, but evidently is closely related to the Katakekaumene inscriptions. In 196 A.D. Mousaios and Kalligeneia paid their vow on behalf of their son, Mousaios, bearing witness to the marvellous acts of the gods (μαρτυροῦντες τὰς δ[υνά]μ(ε)ις τῶν θεῶν). The 'bearing witness' is a variation of the 'publishing on a *stêlê*,' (sec. xiii.); but it is interesting to find a word that became so characteristic of public Christian testimony used of public pagan testimony to the power of the god; μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι (Rev 22^{18}) might be inscribed on every pagan *stêlê* of confession.

[1] Misprinted 373; this fault extends over two sheets of the *Mittheilungen*.

XVI. The Manifest God.

The expression, 'the manifestation of the Lord,' is used six times by Paul, with various accompaniments: ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Κυρίου, τοῦ Σωτῆρος, αὐτοῦ, τῆς παρουσίας, τῆς δόξης (1 Ti 6^{14}, 2 Ti 1^{10} $4^{1.8}$, 2 Th 2^{8}, Ti 2^{13}).

In hieratic inscriptions the appearing of the god in visible form to men is commonly expressed by the same word, *e.g.* in an inscription of the Greek colony in South Russia, Syriskos composed a historical narrative of the manifestations of the virgin goddess (τὰ[ς ἐπιφαν]είας τᾶς Παρθένου [συγ]γράψας)[2]; at Ephesos we read of the manifest appearances of Artemis (τὰς ὑπ' αὐτῆς γεινομένας ἐναργεῖς ἐπιφανείας); and at Pergamos of Sabazios and of Zeus, in which cases the same formula is used (with which comp. 2 Mac 2^{21}, τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας). Again, the god is often addressed in votive inscriptions as 'Manifest,' ἐπιφανής; and the same adjective occurs in a similar sense in Ac 2^{20}, ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ.

XVII. The Names of God.

The most remarkable name that occurs in the hieratic inscriptions is found only in dedications, Ὁσίῳ Δικαίῳ, 'To the Holy and Just.' Both epithets are applied to God in the New Testament; but they are not used together except in Rev 16^{5}, Just art Thou, Holy One. Holy, Ὅσιος, is said of God (He 7^{26}, Rev 15^{4}, Ac 2^{27} and 13^{35} (from Psalms), etc.); Just, δίκαιος (2 Ti 4^{8}, 1 Jo 2^{1}, Ac 3^{14}, etc.).

In regard to such a title doubt exists whether its use in Asia Minor may not be due to Jewish influence. It is certain that the large colonies of Jews, sent to Asia Minor by the Seleucid kings to form a loyal garrison in a strange land, exercised a powerful influence on the development of thought and religion in the country. Hardly any clue to the history of these colonies has survived, because the Jews took Greek and Roman names, and in

[2] Published by Latyschev, *Inscr. Pont. Euxini Or. Sept.* i. No. 184. I gave the restoration of Wilhelm in *Arch. Epigr. Mittheil. Oesterr.*, 1897, p. 87.

inscriptions there rarely occurs anything to show Jewish origin; but the natural probability that such large bodies of Jewish settlers, placed from the first in a position of advantage and privilege, would produce men of importance in business and politics, is confirmed by a recent discovery, which makes it probable that several powerful families, boasting descent from 'kings and tetrarchs,' were of Jewish origin.[1]

It is, however, certain that the god ὅσιος καὶ δίκαιος was often represented as the horseman god (Sabazios), and the pair of epithets is once applied to men.

We can only guess as to the possibility that the dedications 'to the Holy and Just' may have been due in part at least to the influence exerted by Jewish ideas on the pagan ritual of Phrygia. But this is a certainty in regard to another title used in dedications, 'To the Most High' or 'To the Most High God,' Θεῷ ὑψίστῳ. This is indeed found in some cases, where, from date or other reasons, Jewish influence cannot be thought of; but in a number of cases in Asia Minor, where the title is used, Jewish influence is proved by other circumstances.[2] This name is more characteristic of the Old Testament than of the New, though found in the latter.

The name 'the Lord,' ὁ Κύριος, is rather rare in the hieratic inscriptions. It is probably due to Semitic influence, and is certainly not of the Greek type; but it is more likely to originate in the old Semitic spirit of early Anatolian religion than in late Jewish influence. Hence 'the Lady' is oftener mentioned than 'the Lord.' When converts in Galatia and Asia spoke of 'the Lord,' it would hardly be possible for them to divest themselves wholly of the ideas which they had formerly associated with that title. Nor was it Paul's intention that they should rid themselves entirely of their old ideas. He desired to purify rather than to obliterate them, as was pointed out in the opening section. There is no room to doubt that he used the customary language and forms of polite intercourse, and encouraged his followers to do the same;[3] and so far as letter-writing is concerned, that is proved by the comparison of his Epistles and the ordinary letters of the period. Most of these forms were connected with religion, and took a religious cast, as, for example, in Rome a dinner began with an *invocatio deorum*, and ended with a libation to the Lares. Paul's aim was to retain the religious form, omitting only the idolatrous element. That is plain throughout his teaching, and its wisdom is indubitable. His converts were not to separate themselves from the world, but to preserve a gracious and courteous demeanour to all.

Naturally, history showed how difficult it was to eliminate the idolatrous element; it returned in new forms; the old local deities became the angels of Colossian worship and the local saints, even 'the Christ of Smyrna,' in the later Greek Church.

The other titles in the inscriptions, Tyrannos, epithets from the places of worship, like Λαιρβηνός etc., and other unexplained names, like Tiamou, are not such as could have any analogies in early Christian language, though the local epithets came back once more in the later Christianity as epithets of saints.

I have come to an end, but not finished the work. It is obvious that each of the preceding sections has merely touched the fringe of a topic on which much more can be learned; and that our conception of the way in which Asia Minor was Christianized, and of the character of the resulting religion in the country (which played so important a part in determining the Christianity of the Empire), will be cleared up in many respects when the work is properly done.

It may be worth adding, in conclusion, that the rare form ἦρκεν (Col 2^{14}) is exactly paralleled by ἠρκότα, which is used in the same sense, 'having taken away,' in one of these hieratic inscriptions; see *Athen. Mittheilungen*, 1881, p. 273 (misprinted 373), where the word is absurdly and unjustifiably altered by inserting a syllable ἠρ(πα)κότα.

[1] Speculations on the subject may be found in *C.B.*, chap. xv., on 'The Jews in Phrygia.'

[2] The subject has been much treated in recent times; references in *C.B.* pt. ii. p. 652 f.; Schürer, *Theolog. Litztg.* 1897, p. 257; Roscher, *Lexicon Mythol.* s.v. *Hypsistos*; and Cumont, *Hypsistos*.

[3] *St. Paul the Trav.* p. 149.

The True Date of Abraham and Moses.

By Fritz Hommel, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Munich.

In my *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* I devoted a special chapter to the 'Chronology of the Time of Abraham' (chap. iv. pp. 119–146). My main object was to prove that the Babylonian List of Kings erroneously added (instead of treating them as contemporaneous) dynasties A and B, and that dynasty B bears in general a very apocryphal character. Upon this assumption the sixth king of dynasty A, Hammurabi (Amraphel of Gn 14), the contemporary of Abraham, would have reigned not *c.* 2200 B.C., but rather *c.* 1900 B.C., which appeared to be in the best of harmony with the date of the Exodus under Merenptah (1277 B.C.). Renewed examination of all the data, occasioned, above all, by Paul Rost's *Untersuchungen zur altorient. Geschichte* (Berlin, 1897) and C. F. Lehmann's *Zwei Hauptprobleme der altorient. Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1898), has led me, however, to modify in some essential points my former view. I have subjected all the materials to a thorough test, and have thereby discovered quite remarkable harmonies between the traditional biblical chronology (the Exodus 480 years before the fourth year of Solomon, and Abraham thus of course *c.* 2100 instead of *c.* 1900 B.C.) and the Babylonian tradition (Hammurabi 700 years before Burnaburias, and beginning of the Hammurabi dynasty, according to Berosus, 2231 B.C., etc.), Consequently, one has seriously to face the question whether, after all, the opinion shared by many (including, till recently, myself) that Ramses II. was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, must not be finally abandoned in favour of a much earlier date for the Exodus.

We may begin with a few remarks on the trustworthiness of the Babylonian List of Kings as far as the first two dynasties (and not merely the second) are concerned. The last number of the *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets* (vi. pl. 9, 10), published by the British Museum, contains a list, drawn up under Ammi-zaduga, the great-grandson of Samsu-iluna, of the dates from Sumu-abu to Samsu-iluna, according to which the lengths of reign of these first seven kings of Babylon were as follows:—

Sumu-abu	14 years	(Kings' List, 15 years).
Sumu-la-ilu	36 ,,	(,, 35 ,,).
Zabu	14 ,,	(,, 14 ,,).
Apil-Sin	18 ,,	(,, 18 ,,).
Sin-mubalit	20 ,,	(,, 30 ,,).
Hammurabi	43 ,,	(,, 55 ,,).
Samsu-iluna	38 ,,	(,, 35 ,,).

Since the data in the first column are almost contemporary with the reigns referred to, they naturally deserve preference to those in the Kings' List. Unfortunately we cannot check the figures for the rest of the dynasty:—

Abishua	25 years	(Kings' List).
Ammi-satana	25 ,,	(,,).
Ammi-zaduga	22 ,,	(,,).
Samsu-satana	31 ,,	(,,).

But, even assuming that the List is here exact, in the case of the first seven kings there is a difference between the two authorities, as shown above, of nineteen years, so that the total of the years of dynasty A would amount only to 286 instead of 305 years. There is thus all the more justification for the doubt whether the period of the eleven kings of the following second dynasty really amounted to 368 years. On the other hand, our confidence in the correctness of the *names* in the Kings' List is all the more heightened when we observe that the same names and in the same order recur also in the contemporary (Ammi-zaduga's) list.

As to the starting-point of the list of dynasties, Rost and Lehmann have independently of one another recognized that the terminus of Berosus' 1920 years, verified by Gutschmid, coincides with the beginning of the Seleucid era (312 B.C.). But while the year so obtained, namely, 2232 B.C., was erroneously referred by Lehmann to Hammurabi's conquest of all Babylonia, Rost[1] rightly saw in

[1] Or rather Peiser, who already in 1891 proposed as terminus 331 B.C. (accession of Alexander the Great, instead of Gutschmid's Nabonassar, 747 B.C.), and thus obtained

this figure the beginning of the whole dynasty, so that Hammurabi would have reigned *c.* 2130–2087. But, according to the statement of Nabu-nahid, Hammurabi lived 700 years before Burnaburias, and, as the latter is most probably the Burnaburias of the Tel el-Amarna letters (*c.* 1400–1375 B.C.), the coincidence (2087–700 = 1387) is hardly accidental. But even if the reference is to Burnaburias I., who reigned only some fifty years before Burnaburias II., the 700 years taken as a round number would still tally quite well.

According to the acute investigations of Lehmann the third (or Kassite) dynasty reigned from *c.* 1688–1113 B.C.,[1] so that for the second dynasty the period from 1946–1688 is left, *i.e.* some 258 years (instead of the 368 of the Kings' List). The sixth king of the second dynasty, Gul-ki-sar, or Muabbit-kissati, is witnessed to by a later document, under the slightly altered name Gir-ki-sar, as having lived 700 years before Bel-nadin-akhi (*c.* 1025 B.C.), which brings us to the year 1724 B.C. The last five kings of the second dynasty reigned, according to the Kings' List, 132 years (so according to Lehmann's collation), the first six, 236 years. Perhaps only the first six, and possibly also the last king (Ea-gamil, 20 years), should be retained, and the seventh to the tenth inclusive wholly rejected; in which case Ea-gamil will have reigned from 1708–1688 and Gul-ki-sar from 1763–1709, so that the above-named year 1724 would actually fall within his reign. Certainly the second dynasty of the Kings' List retains a half apocryphal character, but what appears certain in it tallies exactly with an indication of time derived from another source (namely, Bel-nadin-akhi).

But now, however it may be with the second dynasty, it is in every way important that there was a doubly[2] attested Babylonian national tradition, according to which the same dynasty whose sixth king was Abraham's contemporary, Hammurabi, took the helm, *c.* 2232 B.C., so that Hammurabi himself, and with him Abraham, must be placed ± 2100 B.C.

With this agrees in a quite surprising fashion the figure one obtains from the Bible for Abraham's migration from Harran. The data are as follows:—

From the Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon (958 B.C.)	480[3] years.
The sojourn in Egypt	430[4] ,,
From Abraham's migration from Harran to Jacob's arrival in Egypt	215[5] ,,
Total	1125 years.

If we now add these 1125 years to 958, we obtain for the date of Abraham's leaving Harran, 2083 B.C.; cf. above, Hammurabi 2130–2087, for which number I have purposely set down ± 2100, because in the 1920 years of Berosus an error amounting to a few decades is quite possible.[6] According to the indications given in the Bible, the Exodus would fall *c.* 1438 B.C., the beginning of the conquest of Canaan under Joshua, *c.* 1398, the migration of Jacob to Egypt, *c.* 1868 (*i.e.* some 300 years before the expulsion of the Hyksos under Amosis, *c.* 1570 B.C.). Of these three dates the first two especially are of the greatest significance, for, according to the most probable estimates, the Pharaoh to whom the Syro-Palestinian Tel el-Amarna letters are addressed, namely, Amenophis III., reigned from 1427–1392.[7] But then the Pharaoh of the Exodus would be not Merenptah but Amenophis II. (*c.* 1461–1436, according to Lehmann), as indeed according to Manetho (*ap.* Josephus), an Amenophis was

2251 (1920 + 331 = 2251) as the beginning of dynasty A (cf. *Anc. Heb. Trad.* pp. 133–138. On p. 137 I assumed that the authority from which Berosus derived his information gave for dynasty B only 248 years, instead of the 368 of the Kings' List, only I still held dynasties A and B to be contemporaneous).

[1] Lehmann's main proof is founded on the circumstance that the fourth dynasty reigned from 1112–981 and did not begin some seventy years earlier, as has been commonly assumed, on the strength of the (false) date of the Bavian inscription (Marduk-nadin-akhi, 418 years before 689).

[2] Nay, even thrice attested, in case the note of Simplicius (cf. my *Semiten*, pp. 342 f. and 484), as appears very probable, also belongs here, the note, I mean, regarding the age of the written astronomical observations of the Babylonians (1903 years before 331 B.C., *i.e.* 2234).

[3] 1 K 6^1. The date 958 (instead of the traditional 1013) is attested not only by the Assyrian synchronisms with the Israelitish monarchical period (Ahab, Jehu), but also by the statements of the Greek chronographers (Hiram, 969–936; building of the temple begun in his eleventh year).

[4] Ex 12^{40}.

[5] Namely, 25 years till the birth of Isaac, 60 years till the birth of Jacob, and finally 130 years till Jacob's settling in Egypt (*i.e.* 25 + 60 + 130 = 215).

[6] Particularly in regard to the first two dynasties; *e.g.* in the case of the first seven kings of the first dynasty, where it happens that we can check the figures, the discrepancy between the Kings' List and the actual number amounts to nineteen years.

[7] Cf. now Lehmann (*op. cit.* p. 160, and the discussions preceding).

designated as such by the later Egyptian tradition.[1]

Meanwhile, I commend this short preliminary discussion to the earnest consideration of all who have given themselves closely to the study of ancient Oriental history; but I myself have already the firmest persuasion that here also the much-despised biblical tradition will once more come off victorious, as it has recently done in so many controversies.

P.S.—The chief reason for placing the Exodus under Merenptah, the successor of Ramses II. (the latter, according to Lehmann, 'at the earliest, 1324–1258,' in opposition to Mahler's 1348–1281), was found, as is well known, in the mention of the city Ramses (רעמסס, Egyp. *Raʿ-mes-su*) in Gn 47^{11} (here by anticipation, under Joseph, *i.e.* still in the Hyksos period), and Ex 1^{11}. The name *Moses* (משׁה), which is probably Egyptian (cf. Jah-mose, Dehut-mose—thus 'mose' clearly being a *nomen hypocoristicum*, or so-called pet-name), has the same sibilant as *Raʿmes-su* (Egyp. *mes*, 'beget,' 'bear'); since now רעמסס, for which (cf. משׁה) one would expect רעמשׁשׁ, is written with *samekh* (ס), there must be here a later gloss. Besides, not only is Gn 47^{11} 'in the province of Ramses,' plainly only a nearer definition of 'in the best part of the land (Goshen)', but also in Ex 1^{11} there stood originally in the text 'Pithom of (the province of) Ramses' (namely, in distinction from other places called Pithom) (cf. P. de Lagarde, *Mitt.* iv. pp. 149 f.); so that here, too, Ramses is an explanatory addition. Against viewing Merenptah as the Pharaoh of the Exodus there is, further and above all, the circumstance that this allows far too short a duration for the period of the Judges (cf., in addition to the above-named 480 years, the important note in Jg 11^{26}, 300 years from the end of the wilderness wanderings to the time of Jephthah), as well as the circumstance that Israel as a tribe between Jenoʿam (east of Tyre, in the territory of Asher) and Hor (South Palestine), is named in the recently discovered Merenptah inscription (*Anc. Heb. Trad.* p. 266), and that Asher, north of Carmel, is mentioned in the time of Seti and Ramses II. (W. Max Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, pp. 236 f.). On other interesting consequences which flow from the earlier dating of the Exodus and of Joshua, I hope to have more to say presently in The Expository Times or elsewhere.

[1] If, on the other hand, the Septuagint, with its 440 years (between the Exodus and the building of the temple), is right, the Exodus would fall in 1398 B.C., and the conquest by Joshua in 1358. This, however, in view of Abraham's being contemporary with Hammurabi, is less probable.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

JERUSALEM THE HOLY. By Edwin Sherman Wallace. (*Oliphant.* 8vo, pp. 359, with Maps and Illustrations. 7s. 6d.)

We need a Handbook to Jerusalem now. We need a Handbook to its history, for Mrs. Oliphant's volume was too sumptuous and too easily written. But, more urgently than that, we need an Introduction to the modern city. Whether we visit Jerusalem or stay at home, we all need it equally. For if Christ is the centre of the Bible spiritually, Jerusalem is the centre locally; and if we are content without an accurate understanding of the city of the Great King, it will go hard with us to comprehend the glory of the Great King Himself.

Mr. Wallace has lived for five years in Jerusalem as U.S. Consul. He is mildly interested in its history, and offers a brief and impartial account of that. He is deeply interested in its present state, and that he describes minutely and masterfully. Without fear he has entered the secret places of all the ecclesiastical sects and laid bare the poverty of their pretensions, while appreciative of any spiritual reality there. He has followed Bliss in his explorations and Dickie in his measurements. And since every step of his narrative is accompanied by a photographic illustration, we have ourselves the means of testing as well as understanding his descriptions.

Mr. Wallace's book records an advance in the

scientific study of Jerusalem. He is shrewd and painstaking, and misses little, while he sets down nothing in offence. And though he glances into the future, it is not a mixture of earth and cloud that he sees, it is a development along lines that are now well marked and sufficiently reliable.

A LIFE FOR AFRICA. By Ellen C. Parsons, M.A. (*Oliphant.* Crown 8vo, pp. 316, with Map and Illustrations. 3s. 6d.)

Under the rightful title of *A Life for Africa*, Miss Parsons writes the biography of the Rev. A. C. Good, Ph.D., American Missionary in Equatorial Africa. It is a short comprehensible biography. Not a needless word has strayed into it. From beginning to end it can be read with pleasure, and it leaves a picture that will not fade away. There is some valuable scientific work; there is more, and far more valuable, spiritual impulse. But its most useful service just at present will be to furnish a description of the actual condition of the tribes that dwell along the banks of the Gaboon and Ogowe rivers, so that the most unsympathetic reader may see the necessity for sending them the story of the Cross.

Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier have also published *Selfhood and Service*, by David Beaton, and a new volume of the 'Famous Scots' series. The new Scots, for there are two this time, are Robert Pollok and William Edmondstoune Aytoun. We have read the book with interest. Miss Masson appears to have done best with her first and least promising subject. Pollok is more attractive than we ever expected to find him.

RECONCILIATION BY INCARNATION. By D. W. Simon, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* 8vo, pp. 387. 7s. 6d.)

Principal Simon, of Bradford, is at once acute and sound; in combining these two characteristics well, and in having both liberally, he stands almost alone among theologians. For the acute theologian runs off the line, and the sound theologian is afraid to carry his railway into new lands. The sound theologian is a scribe, he cannot speak with authority, because he speaks to the generations that are in their graves; the acute theologian speaks to the men of his own generation, but he forgets that they had fathers, he forgets that they have a fathers' God.

Principal Simon's new book needs study. We have studied it with care, and returned to find earlier places intelligible, or at least more intelligible after we had read the later. It needs serious study. In that respect it differs from the new surprising volume of theology by Dr. Clarke, which could be read without a moment's pause or even reflexion, it is so lucid and apparently obvious. Principal Simon is not always lucid, and never obvious. But he will repay study, not less than Dr. Clarke.

His course is limited. God and man are at variance, and have to be reconciled. God is at variance with man, says Dr. Simon emphatically, as well as man with God. They are reconciled by the Incarnation of the Divine Word. So it is the bearing of the Incarnation on our Reconciliation that is his theme. But it is not so narrow a theme as that may signify. Incarnation is a larger word to Dr. Simon than to some of us. It covers, in a way, the Person of Christ. And so this is the purpose of the book, to show that Atonement is the work of the Incarnate Word, and can be the work of no other. It is a sequel to that fine book *The Redemption of Man.* Together they make a fairly complete, a sound and acute, system of theology.

PAUL, THE MAN, THE MISSIONARY, AND THE TEACHER. By Orello Cone, D.D. (*A. & C. Black.* Crown 8vo, pp. 475. 10s. 6d.)

The value of Dr. Cone's new study of St. Paul (of which some notice will be found on another page) lies in its latter part—the exposition of the apostle's teaching. And that part will be most interesting to those who have most carefully studied Pfleiderer's *Paulinism.* Here, however, it is enough to show what is Dr. Cone's idea of the way in which St. Paul's theology came to him.

It all came from thinking about one article of belief—the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. The apostle was mistaken, says Dr. Cone, in thinking that Jesus had risen from the dead. Still, he believed it. Well, if God raised Him from the dead, that act was a recognition of His Divine Sonship. The conclusion followed that His death was an atonement for sin—an easy conclusion by a process of reasoning from premises of the Jewish theology. And on this doctrine of the atonement is founded that of the new righteousness by faith, the abolition of the law, the overthrow of sin and

death, and by a marvellous stroke of religious genius the mystic union of the believer with Christ in the fellowship of the Spirit.

AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By E. Kautzsch. (*Williams & Norgate.* 8vo, pp. xii, 251. 6s. 6d.)

This is a translation into English, accurate and idiomatic, by Dr. John Taylor, of the 'Supplements' to Kautzsch's famous *Die Heilige Schrift des A.T.* That these 'Supplements' deserved both translation and separate publication no one will deny. They form a goodly volume which will be read along with Driver's still more famous *Introduction*, when the comparison will compel thought and check misunderstanding. There are not the materials here as in Driver for the formation of an independent judgment on any of the great literary problems involved. On the other hand, the results of criticism are more rapidly acquired from this book, and it contains chronological and other lists of independent value. Dr. Taylor's translation is most satisfactory.

The fifth volume of Mr. Millar's translation of Harnack's *History of Dogma* (Williams & Norgate, 8vo, pp. xx, 331, 10s. 6d.) covers the important period of the conception and development of the Augustinian theology. Two volumes remain to make the series complete. It was a great and necessary undertaking; it has been carried out with punctuality and scholarly care.

APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY. By H. Hensley Henson, B.D. (*Methuen.* Crown 8vo, pp. 343. 6s.)

Mr. Henson has strong convictions on many subjects, and he has most joy in them when they are contrary to other men's convictions. There are many things on which the Christian Church has gone wrong. Nay, Mr. Henson says that the Christian Church as a Church has gone wrong. Church history is a 'long apostasy.' And he is as sure of his mission as Hamlet, when he said—

> O cursed spite,
> That ever I was born to set it right,

but he has none of Hamlet's sorrow. Accordingly he discourses of the Sacraments, of Christian doctrine, of Church organization, with a glance along the history and a keen eye on the present aspect of each subject, and he dares the wrath of the Pharisees in the very preface by saying that it is immoral to go on using the Authorized Version in the public services of the Church. The chapters are like the modern sermons which Mr. Henson so decidedly denounces, brief, popular, and short. What is disastrous in public worship, he has found necessary in his classes for men. And no doubt he is right both in his theory and in his practice. What is useful in men's classes may actually be disastrous in public services. And in any case such a book as this owes half its interest, and will owe half its circulation, to the brevity and brightness of its chapters.

One person will dispute one thing and another another, but all will dispute Mr. Henson's spellings of proper names. Other names have an occasional chance of their own, but Renan and Weizsäcker never.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS. By John Caird, D.D. LL.D. (*Maclehose.* Crown 8vo, pp. 402. 6s. net.)

The Master of Balliol has not forgotten that even by a volume of sermons a reputation may be made or marred. Out of his brother's stock of sermons, and it must have been large, he has chosen nineteen for publication. Only nineteen, and they are chosen with such care. Principal Caird was a great preacher in a great position. He could not afford to be careless in his work. His sermons were all finished and admirable. This made the selection so much more difficult. For the sermons that live and make their writer live must be more than artistic; they must be that, and inspired. The first impression that the sermons in this volume conveys is, that they are finished works of art. It is only when one remembers that so were all Principal Caird's sermons, that one finds the inspiration hidden behind the art, and sees the motive of the selection. It had been best of all if the art had been hidden behind the inspiration; but Principal Caird was not St. John. And as matter for immortality, art is more than inspiration. In literature, the perfect form is more enduring than the spiritual principle; because the spiritual principle becomes common property in time, the form remains peculiar. So the Master of Balliol has made his great brother immortal by an immortal volume of sermons. Caird will be found beside Robertson and Church in time to come.

Messrs. Maclehose have also published a volume of University Addresses by Principal Caird, edited, uniformly with the Sermons, by his brother. Their subjects are not ephemeral, not passing accidents of university life, but prominent forms for all university thinking. And although this volume will not influence or endure as the sermons, it stands far above the average of printed and published addresses. Once and again it determines an author's position, or fixes a critical judgment in forms they are likely to retain. Yet the authors are so common as Erasmus, Galileo, Hume; the topics so hackneyed as the unity of the sciences, and the progressiveness of art.

MORALITY AS A RELIGION. By W. R. Washington Sullivan. (*Sonnenschein*. Crown 8vo, pp. 296. 6s.)

Every Church and society has its creed, and the creed has some day to be written. This is the creed of the Ethical Religion Society, which meets at Steinway Hall, Portman Square. It does not bind any one, not even its composer. It expresses the general drift—the 'tendency' in ecclesiastical phrase—of the society's faith, and that is all that any creed does or can do. It is an interesting and even an attractive creed. For it makes for righteousness. As much as there is of it, it makes for righteousness. And on the whole this is the only disappointment one feels in regard to it—that there is not more of it. The creed of the Ethical Religion Society, which meets in Steinway Hall, is that we must be good. Now the world has always known that it must be good, and all the men and women in it. But it has not always known how. And that, which is the only difficulty, the creed of the Ethical Religion Society does not touch. We must apologise for comparing its members to the Pharisees, but the Pharisees said, 'We do not need forgiveness, and the rest of the people who do cannot get it,' and that is just what this society seems to say. When the Pharisees said that, Jesus answered, 'I am come to seek and to save that which was lost.' He saves us *to* ethics, but He saves us *by* a Gospel.

So it is really a volume of practical morality, and it is most stimulating.

Mr. Allenson has published a new edition of the Rev. Frank Ballard's undisguised and unanswerable plea for the use of the Revised Version, in preference to the Authorized, in public and in private. It is an enlarged and much improved edition, altogether a more attractive and more persuasive book. That the battle of the Versions will be won by the Revised, there are few who question. Mr. Ballard will share the honours of the victory. But apart from that, his book is instructive. It is scarcely possible that any one should read it and not know even the Authorized Version better than before. Nor does Mr. Ballard desire that you should love the Authorized less that you love the Revised more.

By the Church of England Sunday-School Institute there have been published *Graded Lessons in St. Matthew*, by William Taylor; *Christ and the Catechism*, by the Rev. James Street, M.A.; the volume for 1898 of *The Boys' and Girls' Companion*; and some New Year Addresses. The teaching of these publications is well known. In all cases the effort is made to impart knowledge, the Spirit is left to transform the knowledge into life.

CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE. By the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D. (*Longmans*. Crown 8vo, Part II., pp. lxiii, 519. 9s.)

The first part of Dr. Mortimer's *Faith and Practice* has been welcomed beyond his own expectation. He resolved to issue the second part only if the first was successful. He issues it already on a larger scale and in a more confident manner than the first. This is indeed an inevitable criticism; the scale is too large now, the tone is somewhat too dogmatic. Dr. Mortimer is less to blame perhaps than his subject. In the earlier volume he was theological and sound, in this he is ecclesiastical and controversial. And although it is likely that this volume will circulate more rapidly than the first, for these are the matters that are at present most agitated amongst us, it is nevertheless a pity that a better proportion could not have been preserved in a Manual of Theology of so much promise; and, in particular, it is to be regretted that when Dr. Mortimer was at sea—as he confesses to be at sea in matters of Old Testament Scholarship—he should have taken one side so emphatically. Nowhere is the tendency of this volume to expansion so noticeable as in the chapter on Holy Scripture, which will have to be rewritten and twice as much said in half the space.

Dr. Mortimer writes as a High Churchman, but with a difference. In some points he seems to an Englishman very high; in others, unconsciously very low. With all that, his volume is most instructive. He knows what his mind is, and he can make it known to his readers. He is neither a great scholar nor a great thinker, but he carries common sense about with him, and he can make some popular positions look very foolish.

SOME ASPECTS OF PRIMITIVE CHURCH LIFE. By William Bright, D.D. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. 268. 6s.)

Professor Bright has published five Summer School addresses on the life of the early Church. The addresses are calm and constructive, notwithstanding the keen debate under which their positions lie; the controversy is given in footnotes. Dr. Bright's attitude is too often repeated and too well known to need explanation. But the issue of Hort's *Christian Ecclesia* has been a serious intruder into its conserve. Again and again Dr. Bright has to meet the cumulative argument of Hort, and sometimes he betrays a little uneasiness, as when he speaks of Hort's *bias*. No one knows better than Dr. Bright that bias is a word that may be bandied, and since Hort has not that opportunity now, it ought not to be used. The search for truth gives one opinions; Hort held these firmly, but he always offered the reasons for them. The book is an excellent, short, popular account of the author's conception of the life and growth of the primitive Church.

THE RELIGION OF BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA. By Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D. (*Arnold.* Crown 8vo, pp. 780. 12s. 6d. net.)

Messrs. Ginn & Company of Boston, Massachusetts, have under publication a series of Handbooks on the History of Religions. Mr. Edward Arnold is the publisher in this country. For the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, Professor Jastrow of Pennsylvania University has been chosen, and a better choice could not have been made. Professor Jastrow has done original work on this subject, and he is thoroughly acquainted with all its literature. He is also in touch with the best scholarship of to-day in other branches of Semitic study, and in particular with Old Testament scholarship. And he is able to write easily for the uninstructed reader.

When Professor Sayce's Hibbert Lectures came, they opened a new world to many. For he also has the gift of popular presentation—more unmistakably perhaps than Professor Jastrow, more irresistibly without doubt. But already the Hibbert Lectures are out of date. Professor Jastrow knows that his Handbook will soon be out of date also. 'For as long as activity prevails in any branch of science all results are provisional.' But that is his reason for writing.. It is on the living subject we want the new book. Professor Jastrow writes to prepare the way for his successor.

The book has been in hand for a year or two, and as the new discoveries have come in they have been added to their chapter, swelling the book considerably. But it is not too large. There is superfluity nowhere. Professor Jastrow has given us a full introduction to the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Mastering his book, we are fairly in the grasp of the subject. We shall then be able to follow the new discoveries, and pass on to the more technical literature.

This may be an exceptionally able volume of the series. If it is not, this series will be much heard of yet.

In his 'University Tutorial Series,' Mr. W. B. Clive has published the first volume of *A Manual of Psychology*, by G. F. Stout, M.A. (crown 8vo, pp. xii, 240, 4s. 6d.). It is written directly for educational purposes, but that does not mean for examinations. Mr. Stout distinctly refuses to provide provender for cramming. The book is full enough to give an interest in the subject, thoughtful enough to compel thinking, and when mastered it will be remembered. Manifestly Mr. Stout is one of our most accomplished modern teachers.

Messrs. Cassell have published a new and enlarged edition of *Beneath the Banner*, a book of narratives of noble lives and noble deeds. Mr. Cross has hit upon a fruitful theme and worked it successfully.

In the *Guide* for 1898 (Glasgow: Love, 4to, pp. 228, 2s.) we miss the papers by Mr. Gordon Clark on 'Books that have helped me to the Culture of the Christ-Life.' There are only three in this volume; there used to be more, and the volume contained nothing finer or more lasting.

But there are good things in plenty to fill the gap. 'Mothers of Memorable Men' is a masterstroke of editing, and what an impressive theme!

Mr. Kelly has issued the ninth volume of the *Preacher's Magazine* (8vo, pp. 580, 5s.), the only homiletical magazine we ever saw that seemed to be really edited.

Mr. Andrew Stevenson of Edinburgh has published a small book which ought to have a great circulation, and, as it circulates, will do great good. Its title is *Why I am a Christian* (pp. 84, 3d.), its author Mr. William Davidson, the President of the Commercial Travellers' Christian Union for the East of Scotland. In the first place, Mr. Davidson shows that he *is* a Christian; and in the next, he commends his Christianity almost irresistibly. It grapples with our great problem—the indifference of young men. It demands just one thing—that the young man have something in him to lay hold of. Then it goes to work, and, if left alone, will rarely be defeated.

In *The Ship of the Soul*, the latest of Messrs. James Clarke's 'Small Books,' Stopford Brooke offers us seven of his charming optimistic sermons.

CONFERENCE MEMORIES. By Sir Arthur Blackwood, K.C.B. (*Shaw*. Crown 8vo, pp. 201.)

Into this volume have been gathered the addresses which Sir Arthur Blackwood delivered at the Mildmay Conference between the years 1875 and 1893. These addresses are not only worthy of preservation, they are worthy of the most serious and repeated reading. For Sir Arthur Blackwood was an expositor of ever new surprise and fertility.

Messrs. A. J. Holman, of Philadelphia, have published a new Teachers' Bible. It is new and striking enough to arrest attention at once, and demand impartial examination. The full title is *The Holman Comparative Self-Pronouncing S.S. Teachers' Bible*. Besides a good serviceable concordance at the end, and a number of brightly coloured maps, it has two features in the text. One is the pronunciation of all proper names occurring in the Bible. Every time that a proper name has to be read, its pronunciation is marked, so that neither at the desk nor at the family altar need a single awkward slip or a single moment's hesitation occur. But the distinguishing feature is not that.

The Authorized and Revised Versions are both printed, and not in parallel columns, but in one text. That is to say, where they are identical the printing is as usual, but where they differ the Authorized form is given above the line, and the Revised form immediately below it. Thus at a glance we can see when the Revised Version has made a change, and what the change is. We do not need to laboriously consult parallel columns for either.

The advantage is very great. Besides its convenience and the saving of time, this method of printing the two versions arrests the eye. No one can miss a change, and no one can help asking why the change is made. It is an education. It is the best way to read the Bible, if one must read it only in English. If this Bible could be properly introduced, it would likely prove the most popular of all the Teachers' Bibles in existence.

VISIONS OF SIN. By James Hope Moulton, M.A. (*Kelly*. Crown 8vo, pp. 227. 2s.)

In a touching preface Mr. Moulton tells us how these visions of sin came to him, and why he has given them now to us. They are studies in the word of God. They are studies of certain sinful persons there. And they are for warning, lest we also fall after the same example of unbelief. A half-theological, wholly biblical discussion precedes, of the whence and whither of sin, and the examples are closed and confirmed by certain aspects of sin presented in fairly acceptable verse.

Messrs. Seeley have published two lovely little books, which are as good as they are beautiful, by Dr. Moule of Cambridge. The one is a series of devotional and expository readings in the Epistle to the Galatians, which appeared recently in the *Record*, and now receive the title of *The Cross and the Spirit*. The other is the History and Contents of the Book of Common Prayer, called simply *Our Prayer Book*, an opportune book if ever there

was one, and not less useful that it is not at all controversial.

TRACINGS FROM THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. By C. E. Stuart. (*Marlborough*. Crown 8vo, pp. 430. 5s.)

The title 'Tracings' gives Mr. Stuart liberty. This is not a phrase-by-phrase exposition. It is continuous, but not exhaustive. And it varies the exposition by criticism, philology, or homiletic at will. It is a purely popular book, and should serve its popular purpose well.

From the Sunday School Union comes the seventh volume of *The Silver Link*, with its old, quiet, religious tone, and wholesome family feeling. The same house has published a popular and cheap *Life of Bunyan* in the 'Splendid Lives' Series.

Recent Foreign Theology.

'Catenae.'

So great is the number of newly discovered manuscripts which come year by year into our libraries, and of interesting books which are published almost month by month, that other MSS., which are perhaps of not less value than the newly discovered ones, remain neglected for centuries in the mausoleums called libraries, and that even printed books of importance sink into complete oblivion. When Professor Blass startled the theological world by his discovery that St. Luke published two editions of the *Acta Apostolorum*, it had to be followed by the notice that the same statement was made two centuries ago by L. de Dieu. This had been completely forgotten. Or, would it not be a great surprise if I were to state that in one of the great English libraries there has been for more than one hundred years a manuscript of the eleventh century, older than any of those which de Lagarde used in publishing the *Apostolic Constitutions*, containing the first six books of the latter in a recension hitherto known only from the margins of a Vatican manuscript? And yet it is so.

To such a neglected department of study our attention is called by the little book of Lic. Hans Lietzmann, entitled *Catenen.*[1] What is a 'Catena'? Most students of Divinity, in Germany at least, leave the university without ever having seen such a thing, and with a very dark idea about it, if ever by chance they heard the word; even Professors do not seem to inquire much after them. The very important Catena on the Octateuch, which was printed at Leipzig in the year 1772, I sought in vain in the University Library of Tübingen and all public libraries of Württemberg. If a Professor had asked for it, certainly it would have been purchased at Tübingen in the course of 125 years, which had elapsed since its appearance.

Catenae, Σειραί, have been for the Greek Church since the early Middle Ages what the *Biblia Glossata* are in the Latin-speaking part of Christianity, commentaries, in which extracts from different ecclesiastical authors on important or difficult passages of the Scriptures are strung together as the links of a chain. At first these explanatory notes were written on the margins of the biblical texts ('Rand-Catene'); afterwards it was found more convenient to let text and notes follow each other; after a verse or a couple of verses comes the explanation. In this case the text is generally written in larger letters or in different ink. Some of the MSS give carefully the names of the authors from whom extracts are given, in rare cases with accurate statements from which book the note is taken; others give no names at all. There are great varieties even between MSS which have a close connexion; *toi exemplaria pæne quot codices*. The importance of the Catenae is threefold.

First, for *exegesis and its history*: they teach us how the ancient Fathers of the Church understood their biblical texts, and many a beautiful saying might be gathered from them to adorn our modern commentaries. Secondly, they are witnesses for the *Bible text* which these authors had

[1] *Catenen. Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte und handschriftliche Überlieferung.* Von Lic. Hans Lietzmann. Mit einem Beitrag von Prof. Dr. Hermann Usener. (Freiburg i. B. : Mohr.) Williams & Norgate, 1897. Nett 4s.

before them. Especially in the Old Testament many a quotation from the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, would be lost for us if it were not for these Catenae.

Finally, how many *works of the Fathers* have been lost, or are transmitted to us in a very bad state, through recent MSS! Here are quotations from them. English scholars have made good use of this source; for instance, Pusey, to restore the last two books of Cyril on the Gospel of St. John; H. B. Swete for the Commentary of Theodorus Mopsuestenus on the smaller edition of St. Paul. As a whole this commentary has come down to us only in a Latin translation, but for many parts Swete was able to give the Greek original from the Catena. Not so did Dindorf, when he undertook for the Clarendon Press his edition of Clement; it was then Lagarde who showed in a trenchant criticism that a systematic use of the Catenae is a *conditio sine quâ non* for the editing of almost all ecclesiastical authors. But it is the vastness of the field and the divergence of interests which have prevented hitherto a systematic study. The editor of Origen, for instance, wishes to know wherever a bit of Origen is hidden in a Catena to any biblical book from Genesis to Apocalypse; he is indifferent to all other matter contained in it. The modern commentator, on the contrary, restricts himself to one book, and it does not matter to him so much whether a remark is from Theodore or Theodoret, or any one else, if it be only to the point and—within his reach. But, alas! the Catenae are for the most part not yet printed, but lie in the manuscript-graves, called libraries. In connexion with the recent 'finds,' the Book of Sirach is at present more studied than before; but who has access to the Catenae on this book? How important would it be to know whether all who wrote on Sirach had the book before them in the same confused state as in our Greek manuscripts! Or another example. I am at present interested in the Prayer of Manasses, which found its way from the *Apostolic Constitutions* into the little collections of Cantica placed at the end of most of the Greek Psalters. How many of the Catenae preserved at the Bodleian contain this piece, and at which place of the collection? What do they say about it? The examples might be multiplied. In the contribution which Professor Usener makes to the book of Lietzmann, he is able to prove by help of the Catenae that a commentary on Job, which has been printed in a Latin translation among the works of Origen, is the work of Tatian of Halicarnassus, the only one which is known of this author.

It would be a very good thing if our great libraries (Paris, Rome, Oxford) and our learned bodies found out ways of publishing these hidden treasures.

Θησαυροῦ κεκρυμμένου καὶ πηγῆς ἐσφραγισμένης τίς ὠφέλεια ἐν ἀμφοτέροις, wrote Ptolemy Philadelphus, according to Epiphanius, to the Professors of Divinity in Jerusalem (τοῖς τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκάλοις), in words of Sirach (20^{30} 41^{14}), which have lately come to light in their original dress. May we respect them in our interest!

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The New 'Herzog.'

WITH remarkable punctuality Dr. Hauck publishes every year two 800-paged volumes of his revised and enlarged edition of the *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. In the fifth volume the articles range from DOSITHEOS, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to FELD-DIAKONIE, an interesting account by Pastor Schäfer of the origin in the last half-century of voluntary societies, which, in time of war, care for the sick and wounded under the protection of the Red Cross. At the battle of Leipzig, according to the testimony of a Berlin physician, there were 2000 wounded soldiers for whom there was neither shirt, blanket, straw pallet, nor bed. The change in modern sentiment and practice is described as a triumph of Christian love, or of that humanitarian spirit which is an indirect result of Christianity. 'The most illustrious name is that of Florence Nightingale.'

Professor Kittel of Breslau contributes a new and learned article on

ELOHIM,

which is noteworthy as a concise summary of the various solutions of an intricate problem, as well as on account of its opposition to the theory advocated by Dr. Delitzsch in his article in the second edition of *Herzog*, and in his commentary on Genesis. Dr. Delitzsch derives 'El' and 'Elohim' from two different roots: El means

the *strong* one, whilst Elohim is from a verbal stem found in Arabic, though not in Hebrew, and signifying to be in anxiety, *to fear*; hence Eloah (pl. Elohim), as a name of the Divine Being, means an object of fear. Kittel argues that if El and Elohim can be traced to the same root, such a derivation should have the preference; moreover, he agrees with Dillmann that the Arabic verb to fear is itself a denominative from Allah, the Arabic name for God.

Beginning with the simpler word 'El,' Kittel discusses—(1) the theory advocated by Schultz and Delitzsch, according to which El signifies *the Strong One*, being derived from the verbal stem אוּל to be strong. The chief objection to this view is that the original quantity of *e* in El is short, as may be seen in such compounds as Elimelech, and as is decisively proved by the Assyrian, in which Ilu (with short *i*) = Heb. El; (2) the theory of Nöldeke, according to which, El signifies *the Leader*, being derived from the verbal stem אוּל to be in front. This view, like that previously mentioned, assumes that the *e* in El is long, and for the reasons already given it must be rejected; (3) the theory of Lagarde, according to which El signifies *He whom all men strive to reach*, being derived from a verbal stem אָלָה (cf. the preposition אֶל־, unto), to reach after. This theory accounts for the short vowel in El, but is exposed to the objection that such an abstract conception of God as He who is 'the Goal of all human longing and endeavour' is not likely to have been the original description of the Divine Being amongst the Semitic people; nor is it easy on this hypothesis to explain such a phrase as יֶשׁ לְאֵל יָדִי, 'it is in the power (El) of my hand' (Gn 31[29]), and the use of such words as אֵלָה, אֵלוֹן for *strong* trees, the oak and the terebinth. Kittel is of opinion that little, if any, support is given to Lagarde's theory by G. Kerber's suggested comparison with the two Assyrian words *Anû*, 'the God of heaven,' and *ana*, the preposition 'towards.' So long as the question, 'What does Anû really mean?' remains unanswered, it is of no avail to build etymological theories on this word; (4) the theory of Dillmann, according to which El signifies *the Strong One*, being derived from a verbal stem אָלָה, to be strong. Kittel regards this derivation as the most probable: the short *e* in El is accounted for; the description of God as the Strong or Mighty One emphasizes an essential attribute of Deity; and the conception expressed is sufficiently concrete to be regarded as the root-idea of the word El. In our present state of knowledge, however, a final decision is impossible, and philosophical theories of the development of the conception of God ought not to be built upon the etymology of this word.

In regard to the relation of 'El' to 'Elohim' and to 'Eloah,' Kittel thinks that critical opinion is almost agreed that Elohim is an old plural of El and not of Eloah; the word Eloah he, with Nestle, regards as a singular formed by inference from the already existing plural Elohim.

Before answering the question, 'What is the significance of the plural Elohim?' it is necessary to remember the limitations of our knowledge. In the Old Testament, apart from the passages where Elohim is used of heathen deities, it almost always refers to the God of Israel. As a rule, Elohim is construed with a singular verb and with a singular adjective, but there are cases in which both the predicate and the attributive are in the plural. How are these exceptions to be explained? Are we to regard them as proving the prevalence of polytheism in ancient Israel? Kittel thinks not; in the first place, because this mode of speech is found in comparatively later times when the Israelites' belief was certainly not polytheistic; and, in the second place, because the Hebrew of the Old Testament furnishes analogies which are opposed to this numerical interpretation of the plural Elohim.

In Hos 11[12] the plural of 'holy' is used in apposition to El (cf. R.V.); in Is 19[4] the plural of 'Lord' is found with a singular adjective, 'a cruel Lord'; and in Is 1[3] the plural of 'Baal' occurs in the sentence 'the ass knoweth his master's crib.' The reference in these and other passages is clearly to a single person, and, indeed, it is not likely that from Is 1[3] any one would draw the conclusion 'that in ancient times the ass was the common property of a plurality of masters.' The plural Elohim is best explained after the analogy of the Hebrew words for 'age' and 'youth.' The plurals of 'old' and 'young' are used to denote abstract ideas—the totality of the qualities connoted respectively by those words. Similarly, Elohim is a plural of abstraction, and signifies the totality of spiritual powers as they exist in a single being. That the plural did not obliterate the idea of unity

is evident from the established use of Elohim with verbs and adjectives in the singular; exceptions to this rule are to be regarded as exceptions and not as survivals of an older usage, and they are best explained as a return from the form which was logically correct to that which was grammatically correct. The use of Elohim—a plural subject—with a singular predicate and attributive, proves that the writer had a monotheistic conception of God, or he would not have departed from the regular grammatical construction; but, on the other hand, the occasional use of Elohim with a plural predicate or attributive does not as conclusively prove that the writer is referring to 'Gods many.' In a living language the plural verb or adjective might sometimes be used in conformity to rule, even though the writer believed in the unity of God.

In summing up, Kittel concedes that it is *possible* the plural form of Elohim had its origin in a polytheistic conception of God; but in his view it is *probable* that the plural arose out of men's experience of the many powers and modes of revelation of the one God, and that this interpretation of Elohim is rendered still more probable by the fact that other words signifying 'Lord'—אָדוֹן and בַּעַל—are used in the plural in passages where only one person can be meant.

This volume contains two lengthy and masterly articles on *Einleitung*; that on the 'Introduction to the Old Testament' being written by Professor Buhl of Leipzig, and that on the 'Introduction to the New Testament' by Professor Th. Zahn. Dr. Buhl concludes his article with a high commendation of Dr. Driver's work, singling it out for honourable mention. 'Modern Introductions to the Old Testament are to be recommended as text-books only when they sharply emphasize the distinction between what has been convincingly established and what is still problematical, and this is a special feature of the excellent Introduction by Driver.' J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Among the Periodicals.

Critics and Apologists.

IN the *Theol. Rundschau* of December 1898, Dr. STEUERNAGEL gives a survey of recent literature on the Hexateuch. Such works as Holzinger's *Genesis*, Dillmann-Ryssel's *Exodus und Leviticus*, and the author's own commentary on *Deuteronomy*, are fully discussed. But on the present occasion our intention is to offer our readers some account of Steuernagel's judgment on certain works that have recently been published from the anti-critical side. Although oft wounded to death, if we may believe the 'apologists,' criticism appears always to recover from its death-stroke, and even the extraordinary efforts of Stosch have failed to silence its voice. Of late the anti-critical school in Germany have called in foreign aid against the common foe, and have issued a series of translations of English, American, Dutch, and other publications with anti-critical tendencies. Of these, two in particular are noticed by Steuernagel, namely, Hoedemaker's *Mosaische Ursprung der Gesetze in den Büchern Exodus, Leviticus, und Numeri*, and Green's *Die höhere Kritik des Pentateuchs*.

Against both these authors, and against recent apologists in general, Steuernagel brings three serious charges: that their work is frequently of a very superficial character, that they set up a man of straw for their attacks, and that even their biblical knowledge often leaves much to be desired. He gives an example of the truth of each of these allegations. First, it is surely a very superficial explanation of the interchange of the Divine names to say with Green that *Jahweh* is employed when God is thought of as the God of salvation and of gracious condescension, whereas the name *Elohim* is chosen when God appears as the Creator or Judge of the world. Why then, asks Steuernagel, is the God who enters into covenant with Noah (Gn 9) and with Abraham (Gn 17) called *Elohim*? Why is the God who executes judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah called *Jahweh*? Why is it that in perfectly parallel narratives we find at one time *Jahweh* and at another time *Elohim* (compare Gn $12^{10\text{-}20}$ with $20^{1\text{-}17}$)? Secondly, Green sets up a man of straw to represent the position of critics when he alleges that the latter, whenever the name *Jahweh* occurs in an 'Elohistic' passage, assume that a redactor has either introduced a sentence from a parallel narrative or altered the original *Elohim* into *Jahweh*. Green actually makes this allegation in connexion with passages subsequent to Ex 3, although every critic knows that E tells us in

Ex $3^{18ff.}$ of the revelation of the new Divine name *Jahweh* to Moses, and that from this point onwards the latter name even predominates in E! Thirdly, what are we to think of the biblical knowledge of one who can tell us, as Hoedemaker does, that the eighth day of the Feast of Tabernacles is the day commemorating the entrance of Israel into Canaan (cf., on the contrary, Jos 4^{19}).

Steuernagel brings out well the essential difference in their attitude to Scripture between the representatives of the critical and the apologetical schools. According to Green, Scripture is an organism whose parts are inspired by God, and consequently combine in a harmonious whole. But he refuses to view this harmony as the result of a process of development under Divine guidance; he will not have a human factor recognized at all, because the possibility of human error would thus be introduced. Modern criticism, on the other hand, assumes a divinely guided development process. Green denies, of course, that the critics believe in Divine revelation at all. From first to last, according to him, they have wrought in the interest of unbelief. Hoedemaker thinks to score a point against the critics by quoting the saying of Wildeboer, that 'criticism is simply a strictly scientific historical exposition of the Scriptures,' and then demanding how such an exposition can be given by one who has no clear conceptions about the mode and forms of revelation, its necessity and its aim, or about God who reveals Himself in Christ, or the sinner to whom He reveals Himself. In short, Hoedemaker makes dogmatics the basis of exegesis. Steuernagel argues, on the other hand, that the critics choose the more excellent way in commencing with an examination of the documents that embody the revelation, and in deriving from these one's dogmatic conceptions as to the mode and the form of revelation, instead of beginning with a dogmatic system constructed to be used as a Procrustean bed for the Bible.

The 'Ethnarch' of King Aretas.

The statement in 2 Co 11^{32} that the 'ethnarch' of Aretas watched the city of Damascus in order to capture St. Paul, has been the subject of much discussion. How Damascus, which in the time of Augustus and Tiberius, and again from Nero onwards, is known to have been subject to the Romans, should have been at the time of St. Paul's visit under the dominion of Aretas, has not yet been explained. Professor Schürer's suggestion is that the city may have been bestowed upon the Nabatæan king by Caligula as an act of grace. But another difficulty concerns the use of the term ἐθνάρχης for the subordinate of Aretas. This forms the subject of a short article by Schürer in *Studien u. Kritiken* (1899, Heft 1). The title ἐθνάρχης was borne by the Hasmonæan priest-princes before they assumed the title of 'king' (1 Mac 14^{47}; cf. $15^{1f.}$), and at a later period they received the same title, after the Romans had taken away their political independence (Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10. 2). Archelaus was refused by Augustus the title of 'king,' but was allowed that of 'ethnarch' (*Ant.* xvii. 11. 4, *B.J.* ii. 6. 3). In these instances an 'ethnarch' is a prince of lower rank than a king. With a somewhat different scope the title 'ethnarch' was applied to the head of the Jewish colony in Alexandria (*Ant.* xiv. 7. 2), and to the head of Palestinian Judaism after the destruction of the Jewish State (Origen, *Ep. ad Afric.* § 14). But as a title for the administrator of a king, 'ethnarch' is unexampled outside 2 Co 11^{32}. The familiar terms for such an office are ἔπαρχος and στρατηγός. Schürer thinks, however, that the application of ἐθνάρχης to the governor of Damascus may be explained by having regard to the peculiar conditions of the Nabatæan kingdom. Here it was not *cities* but *tribes* that formed the basis of political organisation. The head of such a tribe is actually called ἐθνάρχης in more than one of the inscriptions collected by Le Bas et Waddington (see the details in Schürer's article). The ethnarch of Aretas was then the superior or sheikh of the tribal territory bordering on Damascus. The latter city was also placed under his jurisdiction and belonged to his 'province,' whose tranquillity the Jews persuaded him was endangered by Saul.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

The *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of 26th November 1898 contains an interesting paper by A. Deissmann on the recently published papyri which were discovered by Grenfell and Hunt at Behnesa (the ancient Oxyrhynchus). A warm eulogy is passed upon the marvellous rapidity with which publication has followed discovery, and the extreme accuracy which, in spite of this haste, has been maintained. Deissmann recognizes the convenience of the order followed, although he finds it

scarcely logical to classify the materials, as Grenfell and Hunt have done, as (1) 'theological' texts (Nos. 1–6), (2) 'new classical' (7–15), (3) fragments of already known classics (16–29, all in Greek like the preceding; 30–32 in Latin), (4) a motley group of non-literary Greek texts of the first four centuries of the Christian era (33–124) and the early Byzantine period (125–158), (5) forty-nine other non-literary papyri which the editors have thought it sufficient to describe without publishing them *verbatim* (159–207).

No. 1 is our old friend the Λόγια Ἰησοῦ, of which so much has been heard. No. 2 will doubtless receive the attention to which it is entitled, especially if it should prove to date, as Grenfell and Hunt are inclined to think, from the end of the third century. This would make it, of course, *the oldest extant remnant of a N.T. writing.* Unfortunately it is only a fragment, including more or less distinctly Mt $1^{1\text{-}9.\ 12.\ 14\text{-}20}$. It is part of a *book*, not of a *roll*, and exhibits a text akin to that of ℵ and B. No. 3 is a fragment of an uncial of the fifth or sixth century, and contains Mk $10^{50\text{f.}}$ and $11^{11\text{f.}}$ in a form of text akin to A.

Passing over what Deissmann has to say on the other 'theological' and the 'classical' texts, we note the importance he attaches to the non-literary papyri. He thinks it is a mistake that these have not been published in full, because from several points of view they are of more interest than the classical fragments, except where the latter are quite new. Especially does he prize the non-literary fragments for the light they throw upon the history of the Greek language. He instances the distributive use of a number like the δύο δύο of Mk 6^{7}, which could hitherto be traced backwards to the LXX of Gn 7^{15} (and oft.), as well as to Æschylus, *Persæ* 981 (μυρία μυρία = κατὰ μυριάδας). The other end of the line terminated in modern Greek. Between these two extremes we had only the doubtful instances cited by Karl Dieterich from the *Apophth. Patrum* (500 A.D.), but now the missing link is supplied by Papyrus Oxyrh. No. 121 (third century), in which one Isidoros writes to one Aurelios that he is to bind the sticks in bundles of three each (εἶνα δήσῃ τρία τρία).

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Sermonettes on the Golden Texts.

By the Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A., Aberdeen.

I.

'So the father knew that it was at the same hour in the which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth: and himself believed, and his whole house.'—John iv. 53.

This was what might be called an instance of putting two and two together. It is rather a difficult thing sometimes to do, though you may smile at the idea of there being any difficulty about it. You think you are far past that stage in arithmetic now, and you look upon it as the easiest thing imaginable. Yet it would seem to be rather an uncommon accomplishment, for it is regarded as high praise of a man to say of him that he can put two and two together. Not literally, it is true, but the meaning is that there are problems just as easy as that bit of arithmetic, and yet most of us may be wonderfully dense with regard to them. We see the thing after it is done, and it appears so simple then that we wonder we never managed to do it ourselves. Newton, watching the fall of the apple, rose from that to the grand idea of universal gravitation, and we all see it now, see its truth and beauty; but it needed a Newton, for all that, to think of connecting the two things in the first place. Nansen concluding that there was a current in the northern ice that would take his vessel towards the Pole, and bring him out into open water again beyond, was another instance of a man putting two and two together.

The Bible is full of examples of those who in various ways did this arithmetical sum. You remember, when Jacob's sons came back from Egypt and told him that Joseph was alive and governor over all the land, Jacob could hardly believe it, and no wonder. But, we are told, when he saw the waggons, laden with corn and presents, his heart revived. Suppose they had brought the waggons without any explanation, what a mysterious,

inexplicable thing it would have been! Suppose, on the other hand, the sons had told their story, and brought no proof with them of its truth, we might not wonder at Jacob hesitating to believe. But when he heard their story, and also saw the waggons, he put two and two together, and would have been very foolish to have had further doubts about the matter.

It is possible, however, to make terrible blunders even in what may seem to be very simple problems. Eve, for instance, made a sad mistake in putting two and two together. The serpent said, 'Ye shall not surely die'; and when the woman, we read, saw that the tree was good for food, she took of the fruit thereof. That was a disastrous mistake. The result of her addition was very different from what she thought. From the very beginning she should have doubted the serpent's words, nay, not merely doubted but disbelieved them. They ran counter to the Lord God's statement, and that should have been enough.

It was not a very difficult problem this Capernaum nobleman had to solve. He had, first of all, the distinct word of Jesus, and, later on, he was told of the remarkable recovery of his son. Finding, on inquiry, that he began to recover at the very time when Jesus spoke to him, he put the two things together, and himself believed, we are told, and his whole house.

But what about ourselves? What about ourselves with respect to Christ? We are often very blind to the simplest operations in the spiritual world. Is it not just like putting two and two together, for instance, to connect our sin and need with Christ's remedy? I find in myself a sinfulness that makes me sad, and a weakness in the doing of right that makes me hopeless. But Christ comes and offers forgiveness, and the power to fight against sin. I put these two things together, and find they fit each other as key and lock. I believe in Christ, because He is so truly suited to my needs. I believe in Him as the power of God and the wisdom of God.

Or, again, the Bible says, 'whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' That is certainly true in nature. You can't sow thorns and expect grapes, or plant thistles and look for figs. The reaping will be the same in kind as the sowing. Now, put that alongside the scriptural statement, and you may be perfectly sure from these two witnesses—Nature and the Bible—that the law holds good for your life. And especially is it worth while to give heed to that law in early years, for we can't live our life twice over to correct mistakes. If things were to be done twice, the proverb says, all would be wise. But may you be made wise from the beginning in the doing of that which you may see now to be a more comprehensive thing than perhaps you thought, viz. the putting of two and two together.

II.

'And said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.'—JOHN iv. 42.

OF all the evangelists we read of, this woman was certainly one of the strangest. She was the means of bringing a large number to Christ, and on the very day she found Christ herself. Faithful servants have laboured for years, and not been so successful. And what was the gospel she preached? A very poor one. 'Come, see a Man which told me all things that ever I did.' She says nothing of the living water, nothing of that profound statement about worship that has filled with joy so many hearts since then. She was impressed above all by Christ's knowledge of her own past.

Well, it *was* a proof of Christ's real and superhuman insight. There are some people—palmistry professors and such like—who pretend to read the future. We should be inclined to ask them, 'Can you tell the past? Can you read my past history? If you do that rightly, then I shall be readier to believe in your claims to read the future.' He who could do the one could do the other also. Now, both past and future Christ reads. You remember how, in the case of Nathanael, He began by reading his past: 'An Israelite, indeed, in whom is no guile,' and 'Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee.' And then He went on to speak of the future, and to tell of the greater things that He should yet see.

Jesus abode two days among the Samaritans,—only two days; but, in a deeper sense, let us trust, He never left them again. In those two days they found Him out for themselves. Who could be two days in Christ's company without having their eyes opened to His majesty, and their ears to the

melody of His message? Nothing is told us regarding the nature of Christ's intercourse with them. Did He read *their* past, too? Did He refer to something which no stranger would know of? Or, were they impressed by some of those loftier revelations, whose grandeur the woman seems hardly to have realized? Surely, if a truth, like that about the worship of God, were descried for the first time, it would smite 'with a solemn and a sweet surprise,' and thenceforth the whole aspect of the world would be changed to one possessed of such an emancipating thought.

Apart, too, from His words, we may be sure there would be something winning in Christ's manner. There are some people we have difficulty in believing in, however much may seem to be in their favour—

> I do not love thee, Dr. Fell,
> The reason why I cannot tell.

There are others, again, we are inclined to believe in, whatever might seem to be against them. The author of *Mark Rutherford* tells of a man accused of theft by his employer. He was not guilty, being the victim of a plot against him by a fellow-workman. He went home and told his wife of the accusation, and said, 'Do *you* believe I did it?' She laughed the idea to scorn. She knew her husband, knew his character, and would not have believed him guilty, whatever the evidence that might have been brought against him. The whole world might be on the one side, but she would stand on the other, even if she stood alone. And so, surely, it would be with any who had the high privilege of Christ's abiding with them two days. They would so know Him, so be drawn to Him, that nothing dubious, nothing inexplicable, would thereafter shake their allegiance. One would like to think it was so with the Samaritans, through all the dark days yet to come—

> Whoso hath felt the spirit of the Highest,
> Cannot confound, nor doubt Him, nor deny;
> Yea, with one voice, O world, though thou deniest,
> Stand thou on that side, for on this am I.

Whatever it was that led the people to believe in Jesus, there is no question that they came to the right conclusion when they declared Him to be the Christ, the Saviour of the world. That was a grand conclusion to reach, and a true one, by whatever steps they arrived at it. And there is one thing in which we ought to be like them; we ought to judge for ourselves. We hear about Jesus, and read about Him; have we lived with Him? Did He ever abide two days with us? If you want to find out what Jesus is, and what He can do, open the heart's door to Him, bid Him welcome from porch to inmost recess, and then you will know from your own experience that He is worthy to receive blessing and honour and glory and power.

III.

'And Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst.'—JOHN vi. 35.

BREAD, water, rest, life: these were the things Christ offered in His great invitations. Bread to sustain, water to refresh, rest to restore, and life which includes all and much more. Bread is one of the great necessaries of life. Daily we must get our supply. The bread-winner is the name sometimes given to the head of a household. In the highest sense Christ is the great Bread-winner for the human race. In and by Him is provision made for our spiritual needs.

For one thing, Christ may be likened to bread in its *universal use*. Bread is on every table. Alike in the prison and the palace bread is needed. And so Christ, as the Bread of Life, is for every heart,—for the learned Nicodemus as truly as for the ignorant woman at the well; for Jairus, the ruler, as well as for the woman who touched the hem of Christ's garment; for the rich man of Arimathæa as well as for the blind beggar of Jericho; for the enlightened and the benighted, for the wise and the simple. The wise must come simply, and the simple are made wise in coming.

Christ may be compared to bread also in its *wholesomeness*. That is the term that St. Paul uses several times in referring to the words of Jesus. He calls them wholesome words, or sound words. And it is worth noting that it is in his later Epistles that he specially does so; that is to say, it is the term that seemed to him, in his ripest Christian experience, to best describe what Jesus was. As we grow in life, we get more particular about wholesome food. In childhood we are apt to have a fondness for fancy things, but, later on, we learn to value plain food, that which leaves no un-

pleasant effects. At forty, it is said, a man is either a fool or a physician. If he has any wisdom at all, he should know by that time what agrees with him. And St. Paul, knowing from his own long experience how wholesome a thing the gospel was, and seeing how much that characteristic of it needed to be realized, emphasizes it in writing to Timothy. In that respect the words of Christ, and of the Bible generally, have been well tested. They alone, in connexion with the spiritual life of man, have proved wholesome, healthy, beneficial.

Again, Christ may be likened to bread in its *price*. It would not do for bread, one of the necessaries of life, to be costly, to be within the reach of only the few. It is very important for a country that its bread be cheap and free from taxation. Let taxes be put on anything rather than upon the common necessary food of the people. In this respect, the Bread of Life is cheaper still; it is the free gift of God, without money and without price. Some, it is true, would fain put heavy taxes upon it. There is the priestly monopolist, for example, who tells you you can only get the genuine article through him. And there is a kind of Calvinist sometimes to be met with, who is hampered by his views of election in giving a free offer of the gospel. And there are some professing handlers of the Bread of Life, whose store of provision lies at the end of an intricate maze; 'tis an ingenious thing to get at it. Away with all such impositions and hindrances! It could hardly be said, in such circumstances, that 'the Lord had visited His people in giving them bread.'

At the same time there is a sense in which the Bread of Life is by no means duty free. If in one sense it is cheaper, in another it is far dearer than bread for the body. As Professor Drummond put it, 'The entry money is nothing, the subscription is all you have.' In new countries free gifts of land are often given to settlers, but on certain conditions, one being that so much of the land is every year to be brought under cultivation. And so is it with God's free gift; we can only receive on condition that we receive to use, and to grow in grace thereby, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. In a word, it is with the Bread of Life as it is with the bread for the body,—we do not live to eat, but we eat to live.

IV.

'In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink.'—JOHN vii. 37.

IT *was* the great day of the feast, in a sense most of His hearers did not understand, when Jesus stood, and cried these words. It was a great invitation that He gave, wide in its scope, bountiful in its offer, and definite in its source of supply. Let these be our points for consideration.

First, *the scope of the invitation*. 'If any man thirst.' No one can imagine himself excluded there. Jesus deals in wide, all-embracing terms in His invitations: 'Come unto Me, all ye that labour'; 'Whosoever believeth.' And His command, to those who were to sound the proclamation in His name, was to go into *all* the world and preach the gospel to *every* creature. 'The sound that God sent all about,' is how an old poet quaintly puts it; and it is sent all about, just because it is an invitation, free and full, that is meant for all.

Secondly, *the bountifulness of the offer*. It is here, however, that a limitation comes in. If the invitation is for whosoever heareth, it does not apply to whatsoever the hearer may wish. If it is for any man, it is not an offer of any thing. 'If any man thirst,' says Jesus. Does He mean that, if you thirst for freedom from trouble and trial, for a way with no cross on it, for an easy life, a comfortable existence, He will grant according to your desires in these things? Suppose that religion did offer all that, what would be the result? There would be no doubt, certainly, as to its popularity, the whole world would go after it; but what sort of religion would it be? It would be simply a scramble after the Almighty,—a universal scramble,—with nothing more dignified or uplifting about it than the scramble at Klondyke or Johannesburg for the golden dust. We might well say, in such circumstances, 'When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?' No, Jesus does not promise to satisfy every kind of thirst. In some ways you may have all the more trouble through following Him. Your very faithfulness to right may involve hardest trial in relation to worldly things. Christ is a specialist. We believe in specialism in these days. We have specialists for the eye, and for the ear, etc.; and reverently but truly it might be said that Christ is

a specialist for the *heart*. He offers to minister just where the world cannot minister, and to give the one thing—a new heart and a right spirit—that no one else can give.

Has Christ's blessing, then, no reference to our daily life and earthly trials? Oh, yes. There is a blending of heavenly peace with our earthly troubles. They lose their hurtful and oppressive weight. And, again, he who lives by the Spirit of Christ is the one who will be most fit to be trusted in his daily work and duties. He will do these all the more conscientiously and faithfully, and will therefore come to be trusted by his fellow-men. His religion should make him the fitter for the ordinary duties of life, and, as the saying is, 'the stone that is fit for the wall will not be left upon the road.'

Thirdly, *the source of supply*. There can be no mistaking what Jesus meant as to the source of blessing. He spake with no uncertain sound—'Let him come unto Me.' The only difficulty might be as to what was meant by coming to Him, for many were close enough to Him outwardly, as He spake, and yet, in spirit, very remote. A poor woman touched the hem of His garment, and was blessed, body and spirit, thereby; and yet, as has been said, the Roman soldiers had all His raiment between them, and it did them no particular good. Two persons may be nearer each other, between whom the ocean rolls, than two who may be climbing the same hillside. It is not miles, but sin, that separates from Christ. Faith will bring us near the Saviour, and a perfect trust would mean a complete union. Then would He be with us, renewing day by day, and safely keeping, till the time come at last when we shall be with Him.

The Unity of Deuteronomy.

By Professor Ed. König, Ph.D., D.D., Rostock.

III.

(*c*) Next I raised the question whether the above interchange of singular and plural has analogies *outside Deuteronomy*. In the course of my investigation I have discovered the following:—

(α) Change of address from singular to plural: the 'thou' of Ex 20^{2} stands first for the 'people' (19^{25}), although in the further course of the Decalogue it came to designate every individual member of the people. To the 'we' of 20^{19b} the 'you' of 20^{20} attached itself, as did the 'ye' of $20^{22bf.}$ to the 'children of Israel' (20^{22a}). The 'thou' of 20^{24} may be individualizing (cf. the sing. 'altar' and 'every place') as in 21^{2} (on the 'thou' of 22^{17}, see below). Then singular and plural interchange in 'thou shalt never vex a stranger, etc.; for ye were strangers' (Ex 22^{20ab} [Eng. ^{21ab}]). For the individual Israelite of 22^{20a}, who is enjoined in the future to show kindness to the individual stranger, had not himself been a stranger in Egypt. The plural of 22^{21} suits both the preceding sentence and the 'any' (כֹּל); but in v.^{22} the individualizing singular is introduced, in harmony with the singular object, אֹתוֹ (the 'them' of the A.V. in v.^{23a} is not sufficiently exact). Then singular and plural interchange in $22^{22f.\ 24ab.\ 29f.}$ Specially important is it that the singular is employed all through the section 23^{1-9a}, but the plural in v.^{9b}, whereas again the singular is preferred in vv.$^{10-12}$, but the plural in v.^{13}. Next comes again the singular in vv.$^{14-24}$, but the plural in v.^{25}. So the singular is found in $34^{11f.}$, the plural in v.^{13}, the singular in vv.$^{14-26}$, and yet 34^{14} contains the causal proposition, 'for thou shalt worship,' etc., to the preceding 'ye shall destroy,' etc.

(β) Change from plural to singular: 'All the congregation of Israel' and 'the elders of Israel,' who are addressed in Ex $12^{3.\ 21}$, are naturally represented in the first instance by the plural (12^{5-24a}). But in v.^{24b} there follows, 'as an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever.' If this singular be not individualizing, it is at least strongly parenetical. This singular is retained also in Sam., Onk., and LXX, and the Pesh. is the first to introduce the levelling لكم، لكنكم. Moreover, this fact contains a warning not to

regard simply as the original text those textual traditions in which the change of number is avoided. With Ex 12^{24} is specially to be compared 'when you reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not,' etc. (Lv 19^{9ab} || 23^{22ab}). After Ex 12^{24b} the author returns again to the employment of the plural in vv.$^{25f.}$ The plural of $13^{3f.}$ refers to the 'people' addressed in $13^{3a\alpha}$, but the singular follows in vv.$^{5-16}$.

In the so-called 'Law of Holiness' (Lv 17–26), where Aaron and his sons (17^{2}), or the 'children of Israel,' etc. (18^{2} 19^{2} 20^{2}, etc.), are addressed, the plural naturally predominates. Its first occurrence is in 'ye shall eat' (17^{14}). But it interchanges with the singular as follows:—Plur. 18^{2-6}; sing. 18^{7} (this 'thou' is individualizing) $^{-22}$; plur. 18^{24-30} 19^{2-9a}; sing. $^{9b-10ab\alpha}$; plur. $^{10b\beta-12}$; sing. $^{13f.}$; plur. ^{15a}; sing. $^{15b-18}$; plur. ^{19a}; sing. ^{19b}; plur. $^{23-27a}$; sing. ^{27b}; plur. ^{28}; sing. ^{29}; plur. $^{30f.}$; sing. $^{32f.}$; plur. $^{34a\alpha}$; sing. $^{34a\beta}$; plur. $^{34b-37}$ $20^{7f.}$; sing. ^{19} (the 'of thy mother' is individualizing); plur. $^{22-26}$; sing. 21^{8a}; plur. ^{8b} 22^{19-22}; sing. ^{23}; plur.$^{24f.}$ 23^{3-22a}; sing. ^{22b}; plur. $^{24ff.}$ 24^{3} (the sing. $24^{7f.}$ refers to Moses) ^{22} 25^{2}; sing. $^{3-5}$; plur. $^{6a\alpha}$; sing. $^{6a\beta-7}$ (detailing) $^{-9a}$ (the individualizing 'thou' is retained); plur. $^{9b-13}$ (detailing sing. ^{14a}); plur. ^{14b} (individualizing sing. $^{15f.}$); plur. $^{17-24}$; sing. $^{25.\ 35-37}$; plur. ^{38}; sing. $^{39-44a}$ (a generalizing plural is found again with special distinctness in 'from the heathen that are round about you,' ^{44b}); sing. $^{47.\ 53}$; plur. 26^{1-39}.

Outside the Pentateuch, too, this change of number is to be remarked. I found the transition from singular to plural, *e.g.* in Ps 11^{1b} (Kethîb), 32^{8} ('I will instruct thee,' etc.), ^{9} ('Be *ye* not,' etc.), 105^{11} ('Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of *your* inheritance'). The transition from plural to singular is accomplished in the prophecies of Malachi as follows:—Plur. 1^{2-8a}; sing. 1^{8b}; plur. $2^{13.\ 14a}$; sing. 2^{14b}; plur. $2^{15b\alpha}$; sing. $2^{15b\beta}$.

(*d*) Further, the question had to be put whether this change of number had analogies. I have mentioned above that the interchange of singular and plural construction of the word 'Israel' stands upon the same footing as the varying construction of other collectives (cf. my *Syntax*, § 346 d–s). But here it is to be added that the interchange of plural and singular is a widely extended phenomenon. This will be perfectly clear if besides the example, 'cursed be everyone that curseth thee' (אֹרְרֶיךָ אָרוּר, Gn 27^{29}), one compare all the cases in my *Syntax*, § 348 m–z, and the passages Am $6^{9f.}$, Ps $5^{9a.\ 10a}$, etc., which I have reserved for another linguistic treatise. This syntactical phenomenon is known under the name of the 'singular used distributively in reference to a plural' (cf. Davidson, *Syntax*, § 116, Rem. 1). But it is well to remember that the general subject 'one' is expressed by the 3rd sing. as well as the 3rd. plur. (see my *Syntax*, § 324 c–h); *e.g.* 'one called' is expressed by קָרֵא (Gn 11^{9}, etc.), or by קָרְאוּ ($1\ S\ 23^{28}$, etc.) [A.V. has substituted in both instances the passive form), and in this respect there are variants in Sam., LXX, and Pesh., which are enumerated in my *Syntax* (§ 324 i). Besides, the circumstance is noteworthy that the general subject 'one' is expressed not infrequently by the 2nd sing. (§ 324 b). In this way certain instances of the employment of 'thou' may be explained, when that word suddenly appears in the midst of an exposition (cf. the 'thou' of Ex 21^{2}, which has its parallel in 'a man' (אִישׁ) of 21^{7}, etc.; the 'thou' of 22^{17} [Eng.^{18}] || כֹּל 'whosoever'; ? Lv 21^{8}). Further, since elsewhere also the subject addressed interchanges with the general subject 'one' (*e.g.* Lv 2^{8} $24^{7f.}$ 25^{26-28}), this kind of interchange furnishes all the less a mark of diversity of authorship (against Steuernagel, *Dt.* 1898, p. vi).

(*e*) Steuernagel has not sought for these analogies to the interchange of 'thou' and 'ye.' But he also has made remarks by which he has himself—unconsciously—weakened the force of his main argument. For he expressly admits (*Dt.* 1898, p. v) that in the so-called document Pl 'some laws are given with the singular (12^{8-12}) or the plural (16^{21}–17^{7}) form of address, whereas in other laws the address is avoided, *e.g.* 21^{15-21} 23^{18}.' Consequently, the presupposed redactor of Pl must have assumed that Moses in addressing Israel could have employed either 'thou' or 'ye.' This possibility must have been assumed also by the 'simple writer' who, according to Steuernagel (*Dt.* 1898, p. ix), united the document Sg with Pl. This assumption of the 'simple writer,' whom Steuernagel presupposes, is all the more important, because this redactor has regarded the change of number as possible even in sentences which are most closely connected, *e.g.* in sentences with the imperf. consec. (7^{8b}), or in relative sentences (11^{8}). No more have the Samaritans doubted the possibility of Moses' having employed 'thou' side by side with 'you.' For the Sam. Pent. has rejected this change of number only in relatively

few instances; cf. besides the above-cited passages, Dt 11^{23} (מלפניכ and ממכ), 12^{16a} (תאכל), 13^{6} (המוציאכ), 28^{62b} (שׁמעתמ). In other instances the Sam. has simply transferred the change of number to another passage, 14^{3} (תֹּאכלוּ, as in M.T. 14^{4}), 22^{26} (הוֹצאתם‖תַּעֲשׂוּ, 22^{24}). In other passages, finally, the Sam. itself offers this change, although it is not found in M.T.; תֹּאכְלוּ (16^{3}), whereas the sing. precedes and follows. In like manner it offers אתמ יורשׁימ for אַתָּה יוֹרֵשׁ in 18^{14a}. These variants of the Sam. are not mentioned by Steuernagel. But it is important to make this addition, in case the impression arose that the Sam. sought to set aside the change of number.

(*f*) In view of all these circumstances, I am compelled to pronounce it too rash to use this interchange of numbers as the basis of a thoroughgoing partition of Dt $4^{44ff.}$ This interchange gives no sure title to separate off either small or great sections of a literary product, and to ascribe these to different authors.

6. But has not Steuernagel brought forward other facts by which the strength of his fifth argument is increased?

In *Rahmen des Dt.* (1894, p. 9) he remarks, '5^{28} and $9^{8f.}$ are by their contents pretty exactly attached to one another. In 5^{28} the command was given to Moses to go up the mount to God; in 9^{9} Moses is found on the mount.' But the בַּעֲלֹתִי, 'when I was gone up unto the mount' (9^{9}), contains nothing more than an historical reminiscence, a reference to an ascent he once made of the mount. Moreover, this reminiscence, contained in 9^{9}, is completely explained by v.^{8}, and this again by v.^{7}, that is to say, an example is meant to be given of how Israel at an earlier period provoked God to anger. Hence the circumstance that Moses in 5^{28} speaks of his approach to God, and in 9^{9} of his ascending the mount, is merely a fortuitous coincidence of the two passages in an external feature. Other tokens of the connexion of 5^{28} and 9^{9} would need to be present in order to prove that these passages were once directly coupled.

Are such tokens supplied by the linguistic differences enumerated in *Rahmen des Dt.* p. 23? There Steuernagel urges that Sg employs the simple יהוה 11 times, יהוה אֱלֹהֶיךָ 32 times, and יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ twice, whereas Pl employs the simple יהוה 23 times, יהוה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם 6 times, and יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ 5 times. But he himself adds 'that in parenetic speech it may have been more natural to designate God as one who is the God of the person addressed.' To be sure he declines to admit the validity of this objection, because also in the parenetic sections of Pl in chaps. 10 f., יהוה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם is not the prevailing form of expression throughout, but is found exactly the same number of times as the simple יהוה (4 times). But it appears to me that this is sufficient, and if one considers the sections of chaps. 10 f. which Steuernagel (*Dt.* 1898) claims for Pl, the simple יהוה is found in 10^{11} $11^{17ab.\ 23}$ (narratives and promises), יהוה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם in 10^{17} $11^{2.\ 25.\ 27f.}$ (narratives and announcements). Besides, Steuernagel has refused to assign 'Jahweh your God' of $11^{13.\ 22.\ 31}$ to his Pl.

Further, Steuernagel (*Rahmen des Dt.* p. 23) remarked that סְגֻלָּה is found in Sg, 7^{6} 14^{2} ('a redactor's addition going back to 7^{6}') 26^{18}. 'Sg uses always סְגֻלָּה, Pl always נַחֲלָה ($9^{26.\ 29}$).' But if it is not already certain that 14^{2} is from another hand than 14^{1}, one is not entitled to assert this because 'inheritance' occurs twice in proximity to 'you' (9^{25}). Further, Steuernagel (p. 24) alleges that the collocation 'eat and be full' occurs only in Sg (6^{11} $8^{10.\ 12}$ 11^{15} 14^{29} 26^{12}). But if the distinction between Sg and Pl is by no means yet established, can one prove it from the circumstance that that form of speech is found only in the six passages cited? How, if in the plural portions, which confessedly bear preeminently the character in question, it was less natural to employ the phrase mentioned? Besides, the latter is found also in 31^{20} (*Dt.* 1898, p. xxxi), a verse which belongs to 'R'! In any case, it is precarious to have recourse to the Sam. (*Rahmen des Dt.* p. 24), where a remarkable expression בפני, 7^{24}) is set aside. In *Dt.* 1898, p. 71, the vv. 19^{11-13} are denied to Sg, because the latter expresses 'neighbour' by אָח, whereas in 19^{11} we have רֵעַ. Yet upon p. xxxiii we read, 'רֵעַ stands as designation of fellow-countryman in Sg side by side with אָח (=real brother) 13^{7}, in quotations 15^{2} (*bis*) $19^{4f.}$, and probably in citations $23^{25f.}$ (*bis*) 24^{10}.' That is to say, Sg does employ רֵעַ as well, and why is *e.g.* 15^{2} a 'quotation'? Steuernagel himself merely says, on p. 55, 'וזה דְּבַר ה'

('and this is the word [A.V. manner] of the release') is a formula with which Sg *appears* to cite older laws (see 19^4; cf. 18^3).' The expression of uncertainty which is contained in the 'appears' may have had very good reasons.

Steuernagel (*Rahmen des Dt.* pp. 24 f.) lays emphasis also upon this, that Sg is certainly acquainted with the pentateuchal source J, and perhaps with E, but that Pl 'had very probably only E before him.' This, however, is uncertain. Even Steuernagel himself (*Dt.* 1898, p. xxxi) says: 'It cannot be decided whether Sg used the composite J E, or only J, or E.' These remarks do not appear to me to be calculated to strengthen the force of the argument drawn from the interchange of 'thou' and 'ye.'

On the other hand, Steuernagel himself (*Dt.* 1898, p. xxiii) confesses that 'the difference of spirit which prevails in Sg and Pl respectively is not such that the one excluded the other.'

Taking all the above data into consideration, I am unable to see in the partition of Dt recommended by Steuernagel a critical procedure with sufficient grounds to justify it.

The Crown of Life.

REVELATION II. 10.

By the Rev. W. Ernest Beet, B.A., Southampton.

The use of the word *crown* in this and kindred passages of our English versions of the New Testament is somewhat misleading, and tends to obscure the writer's meaning. This is due to the fact that it suggests to our minds ideas very different from those suggested by the word στέφανος, of which it is the translation. We closely associate the idea of a crown with those of sovereignty and power, the crown of a monarch being regarded as the symbol of his authority and rank, and thus equivalent to the Greek διάδημα, or diadem, a word with which we meet three times in the Revelation of St. John (12^3, 13^1, 19^{12}), but not elsewhere in the New Testament. In these three passages *crown* fairly reproduces the author's meaning. With these exceptions, it is invariably used as the equivalent of στέφανος, or wreath. Generally speaking, this latter word carries with it no suggestion of kingship or earthly rank, though a partial exception may be found in its use in the Gospels of the crown of thorns which was placed upon the Saviour's brow. There the idea of kingship does seem to be involved, as the crown of thorns was a cruel imitation of the wreath worn by the Cæsars, though even this was very far from being a crown as we understand the term. Elsewhere, however, its reference is to the athletic festivals of Greece, the victors in which were crowned with a garland of pine, of olive, or of bay, as the case might be. The meaning of many passages in the New Testament will be much clearer and more forceful if it be borne in mind that the crown spoken of is not the diadem of the sovereign, but the garland of the victorious athlete. For instance, if instead of *corruptible crown* (1 Co 9^{25}) we read *fading wreath*, we see that the reference is not to the regal diadem, which may endure for centuries, and is about as imperishable as anything made by the hands of man, but to the garland of leaves which, in a few hours, is withered and dead. Thus, when the true meaning of the word used is realized, the impressiveness of the contrast drawn by St. Paul is greatly enhanced. The essential element of the connotation of the word στέφανος—the *crown* of the Epistles, and, with the exception of the three instances quoted above, of the Apocalypse—is that of successful achievement, and not, as the English word immediately suggests to our minds, the royal rank of its wearer.

We are now in a position to understand, more clearly than would otherwise be possible, the meaning of the familiar phrase 'crown of life,' and to answer the question, Under what circumstances may we conceive of life as being crowned? In attempting an answer to this question, we shall do well to turn our attention for a moment to the teleological view of life, which is a marked feature of the idea of a well-ordered society as conceived in the Socratico-Platonic system. Things are

what they appear to us to be only in so far as they achieve the end for which they were originally intended. A sightless eye, for instance, *i.e.* one which does not achieve its intended end, is in no real sense an eye at all; or, to take a favourite Socratic illustration, a ruler, being conceived to exist for the well-being of the ruled, failing this, is in no true sense a ruler. Similarly, we may think of life as really lived only when it accomplishes the end it is intended by the Creator to accomplish. The στέφανος being essentially the mark of achievement, the life which has realized its intended end, and such life alone, can be said to be crowned. Thus St. Paul, in his grand farewell, uttered under the very shadow of the scaffold in the cold, damp dungeon in which he shivers and longs for the forgotten cloak, uses the language of the games when he triumphantly says (2 Ti 4^{7-8}), 'I have contested the good contest, I have finished the race . . . henceforth there is laid up for me the wreath of righteousness,'—the reward of achievement, of strenuous effort which has attained success.

What then is the crown itself? The answer is suggested by the use of the perfect tense in the passage just quoted. The Greek perfect in a sense combines the two ideas of past and present. The action and effort are already in the past—I *have* contested, I *have* finished,—the results of the action abide in the present, and such abiding result of his life's work is the crown of achievement which the great apostle will wear for ever. That this is St. Paul's conception of the crown which will be his is made still clearer in another passage (1 Th 2^{19}), in which he speaks of his readers as being his 'crown of glorying.' Here it is evident that the word cannot bear its ordinary meaning—diadem. The thought in the writer's mind is that the presence, in glory, of those whom he has won for Christ, and who, humanly speaking, apart from his efforts, would never have shared that glory, will be an eternal witness that his life has not been lived in vain, nor his efforts been without success. Thus the glory of the Thessalonican Christians will be to St. Paul what the garland of victory was to the athlete of old, the witness of self-denying effort and successful achievement. In this same sense there is a crown for every man, which he may win by successful achievement of the God-intended purpose of his life. But this end can only be realized in so far as he submits himself entirely to the will of God, and is content to become an instrument in His hand, by using which He will accomplish His own eternal purposes. When the human will is thus brought into harmony with the Divine, and man accepts the Creator's choice as to what he shall do and where he shall serve, then does he fall into his proper place and do his own proper work *i.e.* that which his life was intended by its Giver to accomplish, and so becomes a fellow-labourer with God. Such life cannot be fruitless, and the abiding result of his life's work, enduring when the present age has run its course, and earth and earthly things have become but a memory of a far-off past, and witnessing to the eternal ages that his life has not been lived in vain—this will be to the successful worker a source of exultation and abounding joy, and the 'crown of glorying' which he will wear for ever in the presence of the Lord.

Contributions and Comments.

Discovery of Evidence for Enrolments in Syria.

In The Expository Times for December 1898 reference is made to Professor Ramsay's new book, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* and his expectation that evidence would soon be discovered for the existence of *apographai* or enrolments for the purpose of taxation in Syria under Augustus, such as has been found in the case of Egypt. His expectation was being fulfilled almost at the very time that the reference to it was written. In a garden at Saida, the ancient Sidon, the American missionaries have just discovered the base of a column on which is a Latin inscription, dated in the reign of Augustus, and relating to exactly such an enrolment or registration as is described by St. Luke. The Museum at Constantinople has put in a claim to the monument, but the discoverers are naturally reluctant to give it up.

A. H. Sayce.

Luxor, Egypt.

On Mark xii. 42.

I REGRET to have so often to differ from Professor Blass on matters of real life among the ancients, since I entertain such profound admiration and respect for his scholarship and genius. But discussions on that most interesting subject, the question of the audience for which each gospel was originally intended, must not be allowed to be encumbered by unjustifiable assertions; and Professor Blass's well-deserved reputation will lead many to quote his statement in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (January, p. 185) as true and final: 'The Roman coins, like the *quadrans*, were in circulation throughout the whole Roman empire.' What authority has he for this confident statement? He quotes none; and for a very good reason! Roman gold and silver was used throughout the empire. No gold, and very little silver, was struck by the provincial cities. But the Roman bronze was not used much in the eastern provinces. The cities struck their own bronze small change in vast quantities; and this right in coinage was left to them until the latter part of the third century. From that time onward, Roman bronze coins are found in enormous numbers in the eastern provinces; but one meets with very little small Roman bronze coins of the first and second century, when provincial bronze was current. The word κοδράντης is unknown to me in the epigraphy of the Greek-speaking provinces; and if the *quadrans* had been, as Professor Blass asserts, 'familiar to the Greeks,' it is practically certain that epigraphy would contain references to the familiar coin. The *denarius*, being silver, is found in the East in vast numbers; and the word occurs near a thousand times in inscriptions of the province Asia alone. Those who are familiar with the ordinary Greek spelling of Roman words will be very slow to admit Professor Blass's inference from the spelling κοδράντης in Mark, that the word was familiar to the Greeks in earlier time. A purist like Plutarch used the spelling κουαδράντης, Κουαδραντία, but ordinary Greeks use often the spelling Κοδρᾶτος, Κοδράτιλλα, Κοδρατιανή.

The argument used by Professor Zahn, to which Professor Blass objects so strongly, seems to me (while very far from sufficient by itself to establish his conclusion that Mark wrote for Romans) to point towards that conclusion. The coin was familiar to Latin-speaking people. But the writer who speaks of δύο λεπτά, would never dream of explaining to Greeks these familiar words by the unfamiliar κοδράντης.

The *quadrans* seems not to have been struck after the time of Trajan; but the *centum quadrantes* are familiar to all readers of Martial and Juvenal.

It would take too long to enter on the second point raised by Professor Blass; but much that he says about *prætorium* appears to me to be misleading, and to obscure the real issue.

W. M. RAMSAY.

Aberdeen.

Nebo as an Element in Hebrew Proper Names: Machnadebai and Barnabas.

IN the list preserved in the Book of Ezra of those who had married 'strange wives' we find the name Machnadebai—מכנדבי (Ezr 10[40]). Attempts to explain this form have not been happy: Gesenius in the *Thesaurus* gives, as its meaning, 'quid sicut liberalis.' This is not only to disregard the punctuation—a matter of small importance—but to leave the final consonant without a satisfactory explanation. Olshausen (*Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, § 277 f.) considers the form = מַה כְּנַדֵּב יְהִ; but he evidently rejects the explanation given in the *Thesaurus* of the superficially similar name מַכְבַּנַּי (1 Ch 12[13]). This later name Gesenius held to mean 'what is like my children,' but Olshausen pronounces it obscure.

Hitherto the form Machnadebai, found in our present Hebrew text, seems to have been received without question. As a matter of fact its correctness is open to grave doubt. The versions make it probable that the Hebrew form is a corruption of a name of no little interest for the religious history of the Jews.

Instead of the final י, which is supported by the Vulgate alone, it seems clear that the original name ended in ו; all the Greek forms end in -ου; in the Syriac the proper name ends with ב, but the ו is found before the following name (. . ס ܒܪܢܒܘ).

But the form of the name in the Vatican MS. carries us, if I am not mistaken, much nearer the

original form. There we find Μαχαδναβου, which would be a transliteration of מכרנבו, the last element being the Divine name Nebo (cf. the transliteration of נְבוֹ by Ναβου in v.[43]). The last part of the name is the same in א— Αχαδναβου; but the Alexandrine Codex and the Lucian Recension (in Lagarde's *Vet. Test. Græce*) show already the transposition of the letters נ and ר which we find in M.T.: thus A Μαχναδααβου; Lucian, καὶ Ναδαβου.

The first part of the restored form is not easy of explanation. But in view of the innumerable instances of the confusion of ד and ר there can be no objection to reading מכרנבו, and interpreting 'possession of Nebo.' In his *Assyr. Wörterbuch* (p. 408 *a*) Fried. Delitzsch cites the name Namkur-Ašhur = 'possession of Ashur,' in which the first element is a noun from the same root as the first element in the emended form of our name מכרנבו.

If מכרנבו be the real form, the form in M.T. may be due to transcriptional error; or it may be intentional. There are other instances of the mutilation of the Divine name Nebo; Abednego (Dn 1[7]) is a mutilated form of Abed-Nebo (servant of Nebo)[1]; and the best explanation of Nu 32[38] is that of Dillmann, who treats the words 'their names being changed' as a gloss directing that Nebo and Baal-meon are to be pronounced otherwise than they are written, so as to avoid the pronunciation of the names of heathen deities.

I have referred elsewhere (*Studies in Hebr. Proper Names*, p. 145) to a few post-exilic names containing the names of foreign deities, which 'may with probability be accounted for as due to worship of these gods in captivity.' Other instances, which should also have been cited there, and which are of double importance in the present connexion as being at once instances of Babylonian names borne by post-exilic Jews and names of Jews containing a reference to heathen deities, are מרדכי (Ezr 2[2]) and שראצר . . . (Zec 7[2]). The first of these is most plausibly explained as connected with the god Marduk; the second is in its present condition a mutilated form with the omission of a Divine name at the beginning.[2] In this last instance, again, the mutilation may be intentional; then the name is not to be restored merely by attaching to it the last part of the previous word בית־אל. A Jewish scribe would not have been offended with such a name as אלשראצר = 'El (or God) protect the prince'; for he would naturally interpret El of Yahwè.

The New Testament probably furnishes us with another instance of a Jewish name compounded with Nebo. For the actual etymology of the familiar name Barnabas (Βαρνάβας) appears to be ברנבו = 'son of Nebo.' Obvious as this should have been, it is only quite recently that it has been discerned. It was first pointed out by Deissmann, who has elaborately justified his suggestion.[3] Dalman, who had done[4] his best to find an etymology agreeable to the interpretation of the name given in Ac 4[36], has now[5] adopted Deissmann's suggestion. The name Bar-nebo is of a type very common in Aramaic[6] and some other Semitic dialects. A Phœnician instance is perhaps[7] to be found on a recently published inscription from Cyprus—the home of Barnabas. Compounds with Nebo, have not, so far as I am aware, been yet found in Cyprus; but such compounds are common not only in Babylonian, but also in Palmyrene, as Dalman has pointed out, citing some of the instances. I have elsewhere drawn attention to one striking feature common to Palmyrene and post-exilic Jewish names.[8] It is certainly, then, not improbable that the name Bar-nebo was current in Cyprus.

If the Greek form Βαρνάβας occurred in a narrative as the name of a non-Jewish but Semitic Cypriot, the etymology offered by Deissmann could scarcely have been questioned.

But there are two difficulties occasioned by the context. Would a name with such a meaning, it may be asked, have been conferred by Jewish parents of the first cent. B.C. or A.D.? Does not the etymology suggested conflict with the statement of the writer that it was conferred by the apostles on account of its meaning 'son of consolation'?

In reply to the first of those questions it must be said that the name may have been given by the parents not on account of, or with any clear con-

[1] See *e.g.* Bevan on Dn 1[7].

[2] Cf. *e.g.* Wellhausen or Nowack on Zec 7[2]; or G. A. Smith, *Book of the Twelve*, ii. p. 322.

[3] *Bibelstudien* (1895), pp. 175–178; *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897), pp. 15 f.

[4] *Grammatik des jüd. paläst. Aramäisch* (1894), p. 142, n. 1.

[5] *Die Worte Jesu* (1898), p. 32.

[6] See *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, pp. 68 f., 70 f.

[7] *Ib.* p. 68, n. 1.

[8] *Ib.* pp. 223 f.

sciousness of, its original meaning, but in memory of, or as a compliment to, some person not necessarily a Jew. This would have been in accordance with then prevailing custom.[1]

As to the second difficulty. It must be admitted that if the proposed etymology be correct, the statement in Acts is not absolutely accurate. But it should be remembered that the interpretations of names given in the Old Testament are not, generally speaking, identical with their etymological significance. For instance, Noah has nothing to do etymologically with the Hebrew *naḥem*; but because it *resembled* it in sound, the story grew up that the name was given to Noah because he 'comforted' people. Similarly, the second part of the name Barnabas may have recalled to the apostles a Semitic word of somewhat similar sound, which meant παράκλησις, and they may in consequence have been accustomed to interpret the name accordingly. It is easy to believe that anyone who was aware of the apostolic *interpretation* may have inferred the apostolic *origin* of the name. All that we need to conclude, then, is that there is a slight unimportant inaccuracy in the statement of Ac 4^{36}, due to a mistaken inference on the part of the writer of Acts or of his informant.

G. Buchanan Gray.

Oxford.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I notice that Professor Cheyne in Zec 7^{2} restores Bel-sharezer, of which he considers Bilshan to be another mutilation (*Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, p. 10). He also identifies Raamiah and Regem-melech; if this be right, we have another instance of the attempt of the Scribes to obliterate traces of foreign deities in Jewish proper names.

1 Peter ii. 7.

In A.V. this verse reads: 'Unto you therefore which believe (He is) precious.' In R.V. it runs more exactly in accordance with the text: 'For you therefore which believe is the preciousness.' Still this rendering leaves much to be desired in point of clearness and precision. And another, more definite and expressive, is suggested by comparison with an O.T. parallel in Ps 149^{9}: 'This honour have all His saints.'

In both cases the construction of the sentence is the same (cf. LXX *in loco*). And in the context here (vv.$^{4-5}$) an intended contrast seems to be drawn to that which is represented in Ps 149^{6-9}. There, in succinct detail, the honour of the saints of the O.T. Church is figured thus—

> 'Let the high praises of God be in their mouth,
> And a two-edged sword in their hand;
> To execute vengeance upon the heathen,
> And punishments upon the people:
> To bind the kings with chains,
> And their nobles with fetters of iron;
> To execute upon them the judgment written:
> This honour have all His saints.'

This is an idea of the honour of saints, which fits in with the period, and the stage of revelation of the mind of the Spirit. It represents the Church as 'an army terrible with banners' (Ca 6^{10}). She finds herself engaged in a conflict, which, to her view, wears not the features of a spiritual contest—a fight of faith—so much as the character of a war of extermination. The description by the Psalmist reads almost like an anticipation of those in which the war correspondents of the daily Press portrayed the army of the Dervishes at the battle of Omdurman.

This ideal of the honour of saints was one which would naturally be suggested to the minds of the strangers—*gērim*—in prospect of 'the fiery trial' before them (chap. 4^{12}). But, from his own experience, Peter was aware (Mt 26^{52}) that the day of the sword had passed. The era of the Spirit had come. And, accordingly, with kindly forethought, Peter places before his correspondents an ideal more in keeping with the character of the Church of Christ. For the mission of the Church is no longer to be conceived as that of a David, but of a Solomon,—not to wage exterminating wars, but to build a house of God.

Accordingly, reading οἰκοδομεῖσθε (v.^{5}) as an imperative (with many authorities; cf. Alford *in loco*.), this rendering seems natural: 'You then who believe have *the* (*i.e. this*) honour.'

V.^{6} is a parenthesis. The direct connexion of v.^{7} is with vv.$^{4-6}$, which, under certain forms of distinction set forth the privilege and duty of believers.

First, in v.^{5} the 'strangers' are summoned to the spiritual enterprise, as the restored exiles were

[1] See *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, pp. 7 f.

exhorted by the later prophets to carry through the re-erection of the temple in Jerusalem.

Next, in v.[6] all doubt is removed as to the propriety of the undertaking by the authority of the instance in which the new foundation of the kingdom was laid in Zion to supplant the earlier institution of the judgeship established under the Covenant of Sinai.

And, finally, as an incentive to effort, Peter adds this appeal to their sense of honour: 'You then who believe have this honour.'

Read thus, the verse yields at once a sense pertinent to the situation. It suggests the immense progress in spiritual apprehension from the days of the psalmists to those of the apostles. And the view of duty which it gives has in it a 'strong consolation' for those who found themselves 'strangers in a foreign land in manifold temptations.'

A. THOM.

Tullibody.

The Lord's Supper.

I ASK leave to enter an earnest protest against the inaccuracy and the incaution of Mr. Caie's utterances in note on p. 90 in November number. How inaccurate to speak of the Last Supper, whether Paschal or not, as having taken place on the night *before* Christ was betrayed! (1 Co 11[23]). How incautious to aver that while 'the Synoptic writers declare that Jesus and His disciples ate the Passover,' 'the writer of the Fourth Gospel *declares* that there was no Passover eaten'! The confession of difficulty in reconciling statements in the Gospels is one thing; the bold assertion of flat contradiction is quite another. In striking contrast with the temerity of Mr. Caie's statements, let me quote the late Dr. Hanna's calm and well-weighed words:—

'The four evangelists agree in stating that it was upon a Sunday, the day after the Jewish Sabbath that our Lord rose from the grave, and that it was on the day preceding the Sabbath, that He was crucified. They all assign the same events to the same days of the week: the last supper to Thursday evening; the crucifixion to Friday; the lying in the tomb to Saturday; the resurrection to Sunday. But there is an apparent discrepancy in the accounts of the three earlier evangelists, as compared with that of St. John, as to the relation of these days of the week to the Jewish days of the month and of the feast. If we had only the narratives of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke before us, we must have at once concluded that our Lord partook of the Passover Supper at the same time with the Jews. On the other hand, if we had only the narrative of St. John before us, we should as naturally have concluded that it was upon the evening after the crucifixion that the Paschal Supper was observed generally by the Jews, and that Jesus must have ante-dated His observance of it, partaking of it a day before the usual one, on the evening of the 13th day of the month Nisan. The removal of this discrepancy is one of the most difficult problems with which harmonists of the Gospels have had to deal, nor is there any single question touching the chronology of our Saviour's life upon which more labour and learning have been bestowed. The matter still remains in doubt. No doubt whatever exists as to the fact that, whether He anticipated the ordinary time or not, it was that He might observe the Jewish Passover with His disciples, that our Lord, on the night of His betrayal, sat down with His twelve apostles in the guest-chamber at Jerusalem' (*Our Lord's Life on Earth*, p. 429).

At present I add only that to this subject I have given much earnest thought, and that it continues to engage my attention from time to time. If I ever arrive at a conclusion satisfactory to myself, I may ask to be permitted to submit it to the judgment of the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

R. M. SPENCE.

Manse of Arbuthnott.

Prayers for the Dead.

I.

WHETHER such prayers are permissible in the English Church must mainly depend upon the language of the Prayer-Book as it now stands. Professor Sayce has quoted two passages which appear to give sanction to such prayers, the first from the Prayer for the Church Militant; the second from the Prayer of Oblation. An editorial comment follows, dealing with the significance of the second quotation. Does then 'We, and all Thy whole Church' mean, with Professor Sayce,

the Church invisible as well as the Church visible, or is the editorial conclusion a sound one that 'all Thy whole' is a 'mere redundancy'?

In deciding which of these two views is right, the greatest possible weight must surely be attached to the testimony of one who had so significant a share in the work of revision as Bp. John Cosin. He clearly makes the phrase refer to those that are departed in the faith, as well as to the faithful living. His language runs: 'By all the whole Church is to be understood as well those that have been here before, and those that shall be hereafter, as those that are are now members of it.'[1]

Again in his paper, addressed to the Countess of Peterborough, on the 'Agreements' in the chief points of religion betwixt the Church of Rome and the Church of England, he thus expresses himself:—

'We are at accord with the Roman Catholics in giving thanks to God for them that are departed out of this life, in the true faith of Christ's Catholic Church; and in praying to God, that they may have a joyful resurrection, and a perfect consummation of bliss, both in their bodies and souls in His eternal kingdom of glory.'[2]

This latter extract from Bp. Cosin's works suggests that there is yet another passage in the English Prayer-Book which countenances prayers for the dead. This occurs in the first of the two Collects at the close of the Burial Office. The language runs thus: 'That we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory.' The phraseology of the Burial Service is so closely linked with that in the Communion Service that the one becomes reasonably interpretative of the other; and if so, Professor Sayce's contention is a true one.

If these three passages are taken together it is plain that the Prayer-Book, even from the standpoint of its latest revisions, does countenance prayers for the dead; and if its language exhibits a wise hesitancy on the issue, in contrast with the rash precision of mediæval theology, it is only what an examination of the principles of the Reformation at once Catholic and Protestant would lead a student to expect.

[1] Bp. Cosin's Works, vol. v., quoted in Luckock's *Prayers for the Dead*.

[2] Bp. Cosin's Works, vol. iv. p. 336, edition of 1851.

John Wesley, as is well known, was decisively in favour of the permissibility of such prayers.

B. Whitefoord.

Theological College, Salisbury.

II.

In The Expository Times for December, Professor Sayce states that in the Church of England public prayer for the dead is sanctioned by the Communion Office; and in proof he quotes from the Prayer for the Church Militant.

But a comparison of the Prayer-Book of 1549 with that of 1662 shows that prayers for the dead were deliberately removed by the Revisers. In this particular the final revision is at one with the first Puritan revision of 1552. The intention of the present Prayer-Book seems to be placed beyond doubt by the contrast between the following parallel passages:—

1. In the Prayer for the Church Militant we find in 1549: 'We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace. Grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace.'

In 1662 the corresponding passage runs: 'And we also bless Thy name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear, beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples that *with them we* may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom.'

2. In the Burial Service in 1549 one of the collects contained the words: "Grant unto us Thy servants that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no sorrow, sighing, nor heaviness; and, when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive his body again to glory.'

In 1662, the words substituted are: 'We give Thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleased Thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world; beseeching Thee that it may please Thee of Thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom that *we, with all those* that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy name, may have our

perfect consummation and bliss in Thine eternal and everlasting glory.'

The words 'with them,' in the former passage, and 'with all those' in the latter, are evidently not meant as a prayer *for* them, but imply the assumption that the faithful dead already are partakers of Christ's kingdom. The prayer is that we may so live as to join them there.

3. Another collect in the Burial Service of 1549 reads: 'We meekly beseech Thee that, at the general resurrection in the last day, both we *and this our brother departed*, receiving again our bodies and rising again in Thy most gracious favour, may with all Thine elect saints obtain eternal joy.'

But in 1662 the words run: 'We meekly beseech Thee that at the general resurrection in the last day we may be found acceptable in Thy sight.'

All other prayers for the dead found in the 1549 Prayer-Book are entirely omitted from the 1662 revision. Surely the inference is irresistible that the Revisers meant to discountenance all prayer for the departed in the public services of the Church.

Private prayers, as the Archbishop of Canterbury pointed out in his charge, stand on a different footing. There is nothing in the Prayer-Book to forbid a man to pray anything he wishes in his own family or chamber. Here, as in other matters, the Church allows liberty, leaving every member to the guidance of conscience and the Bible. But what is not forbidden to the individual in his own home may be inexpedient in public worship; for it may then be claimed as the deliberate teaching of the Church, and dangerous inferences may be drawn. Moreover, what is not forbidden is not necessarily sanctioned, but at most left an open question.

GEORGE G. BROWN.

All Saints Rectory, Colchester.

III.

LET us admit in full the truth of the Editor's appendix to the note by Professor Sayce on this subject in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December (p. 143). '*All* Thy *whole* Church' is a mere redundancy, and means no more than 'all Thy Church' or 'Thy whole Church.' Obviously, it *cannot* mean any more. Nevertheless, 'all Thy Church' or 'Thy whole Church' cannot mean merely 'a fraction of Thy Church'; and to limit the expression to 'the Church militant here on earth' is to make the whole mean only a part. Professor Sayce's argument remains untouched by the Editor's criticism. Moreover, we have Bishop Cosin's own interpretation of the phrase in question; and as one of the Revisers, his interpretation has authority. He says that by it 'is to be understood, as well those that have been here before, and those that shall be hereafter, as those that are now members' of the Church on earth.

Article XXII., which condemns the invocation of saints, does not condemn prayers for the dead, and there is evidence in existence to show that this omission to prohibit prayers for the dead was deliberate.

What is much more important (because it is a consideration which touches those who do not accept the authority of the XXXIX. Articles, or of the Book of Common Prayer), is the fact that the Bible nowhere condemns prayers for the dead. My own conviction is that the Bible sanctions such prayers. But I do not care to press that. The burden of proof rests with those who condemn their fellow-Christians for following the ancient and reasonable practice of interceding for the departed. Does the Bible sanction such condemnation? Until that has been proved, those who pray for the dead are well within their rights as Christians.

The practice is reasonable, because the departed are still alive, are not yet perfect, and are therefore capable of progress. If they are capable of progress, they may be aided in that progress by the prayers of the living. To deny this seems to come perilously near denying the efficacy of prayer altogether. Is there anything for which we may pray with better hope of success than for the advancement of other souls in holiness?

A. PLUMMER.

Durham.

1 Pet. i. 21.

Τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν, Professor Hort calls in his newly published lectures a remarkable phrase, and he devotes to its explanation several pages. 'The remarkable phrase is confined, as he says, to two or three of the best documents and a good cursive (9) in the Cambridge University Library.' 'The combination of πιστοὺς with εἰς is apparently without example elsewhere.' Finally, 'Δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς is a *unique combination*. *Wherever* πιστεύω

διὰ *with gen. occurs, the instrumentality is human*: the Baptist (Jn 1^{7}), or Apollos and Paul (1 Co 3^{5}); cf. Jn 17^{20}, *τῶν πιστευσόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ. The only approximate parallel to this passage is the second clause of Acts* 3^{16}, *ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ* (the lame man) *τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην.'*

Truly, there can be no more significant example of the deep neglect under which the New Testament treasure of Cambridge, the Codex Cantabrigiensis *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, has suffered hitherto, than the latter statement from the pen of the late theological glory of Cambridge. When I first began to study the Codex Bezæ, I was struck by the observation that it offers several times the combination which Professor Hort calls unique: *πίστις διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου*. Blass gives under this very heading in the index of his edition of the Acts (p. 326) a reference to 20^{21}, and at 20^{21} he refers to 18^{8}. So did I in my collation of Codex Bezæ (1896); at 20^{21}, after the reading *πίστιν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, I added 'cf. 18^{8}'; there Codex Bezæ has: *ἐβαπτίζοντο, πιστεύοντες τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

These readings appeared to me, from the very outset, so remarkable and original, 'conversion to God, and believe in God *through* Jesus Christ,' that I cannot understand how Professor Weiss passes over the second passage with complete silence in his recent investigation of Codex D. The former is classified by him under the 'characteristic alterations of the text in D.' Was perhaps the copyist of D a rationalist, that he changed his text in this direction? *Believe in* God *through* Christ; certainly he has now the support of St. Peter, or rather *πιστεύειν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου* is no longer a unique combination in the New Testament.

In later times we read (*Apostolic Constitutions*, 7, 38, ed. Lagarde, p. 222), *τοῖς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστεύσασιν εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων Θεόν.*

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Textual Criticism in the Service of Archaeology.

1. Dt 33^{19} (R.V.)—

> 'For they shall suck the abundance of the seas,
> And the hidden treasures of the sand.'

Dillmann's note on this passage is an excellent specimen of caution. He points out that if we follow G. Hoffmann in omitting one of the two passive participles which exist side by side in the second line (ספוני and טמוני), we make the line too short. He also, in explaining 'abundance of the seas' and 'treasures of the sands,' takes care not to give too definite an opinion.

'The reference is a general one to the profit and prosperity which they (Zebulun and Issachar) will gain from their maritime situation; whether more as dealers in the goods brought by merchants, or directly by navigation, fishing, and the like, is undetermined. In the latter respect, according to the Targum of Jonathan, reference is made to the quest of fishes, sponges for baths, purple-fish, and purple-dyeing, and with regard to the treasures of the sand to the manufacture of glass, on the shore of the river Belus, south of Acco, and also to the north of Acco.' Dr. Driver commits himself a little more, at any rate on the subject of the reference to glass-making. But it is very doubtful whether there is any reference to the making of glass in the Old Testament. Glass no doubt is referred to (זְכוּכִית). But neither Shihor-libnath nor Mis-rephoth-maim can furnish the basis of an historical theory. Looking now at Dt 33^{19b}, we are struck by the improbability that ספוני and טמוני should both be right. It is true, symmetry forbids us to expunge either of them as a gloss, but these two passive participles, side by side, appear suspicious, and our suspicion is not lightened, but rather increased, by Job 20^{17}, referred to by Dillmann. יינקו in *a* suggests that טמוני may have arisen out of יִמְצוּן, a synonymous word. חוֹל, 'sand,' is not at first sight suspicious; it would seem to be so nicely parallel to וּמְיִם. But is it really parallel? יַמִּים means, not 'the sea,' but 'the ocean'; but חוֹל of course means the sand of the shore of North Palestine. The (partly) parallel passage in Gn 49^{13} gives אֳנִיּוֹת, 'ships,' as the parallel to יַמִּים, 'ocean.' 'Treasures of ships' would be a very satisfactory substitute for the obscure 'treasures of the sand.' The Septuagint gives *καὶ ἐμπόρια παράλιον κατοικούντων.* The two last words may represent שֹׁכְנֵי חוֹף, the demerits of which as a reading I need not mention. The remedy, however, is simple; it is simply to recollect the habits of scribes and the perils of Hebrew texts. Evidently חול comes from חרל; this by transposition comes from רחל; ח and ב being phonetically akin were confounded, hence רחל

passed into רכל. רֹכְלִים or רֹכְלֵי is the only possible reading in lieu of חול. Probably יִמְצוֹן should be read for טמוני. Thus we get the rendering, 'And the treasures of merchants shall they suck' (*i.e.* grow rich upon).

2. 1 S 15^7 27^8 (R.V.)—

'And Saul smote the Amalekites, from Havilah as thou goest to Shur, that is before Egypt.'

'And David and his men went up, and made a raid upon the Geshurites, and the Girzites, and the Amalekites: for those (nations) were the inhabitants of the land, which were of old, as thou goest to Shur, even unto the land of Egypt.'

All critics have been struck by the difficulties of these passages. Wellhausen and Driver find it necessary to read 'from Telam' (מִתֵּלָם) for 'from Havilah' (מֵחֲוִילָה) and 'of old' (מֵעוֹלָם). The correction of 27^8 makes it the land, not the people to which reference is made. (Telam was the place where Saul mustered his forces before his Amalekite campaign, 1 S 15^4.) But Telam (Telem, Jos 15^{24}) is hardly the place we expect to find in a definition of the geographical limits of the Amalekites. Probably enough it was near the Amalekites' border, but the Amalekite country could not be said to extend as far as a city of Judah, unless, indeed, that city chanced to be on a river which formed the boundary, and then the Judahite city would not require to be mentioned. The latest commentator (Löhr) therefore prefers to keep 'from Havilah' in 15^7, and to substitute it for 'from of old' in 27^8. But this again is not very satisfactory. It implies that the writer copied Gn 25^{18} in the most servile manner, without the vaguest comprehension of the meaning of Havilah. Winckler, with his usual independence, suggests another way, viz. to read in both passages, מֵעוֹלָם, rendering 'from Olâm, which is on the pass of Šur.'[1]

It is clear to me that in both passages we should read מִנַּחַל בִּשׁוֹר, 'from the Wâdy Bĕsōr.' With fine insight, Klostermann has restored this in 27^8; it only remains to restore it in 15^7. The נחל of 15^5 is also probably the Wâdy Bĕsōr, which Saul would have to cross to meet the Amalekites on their own land. That this correction will at once commend itself to an unpractised student, is not to be expected. But as he goes deeper in his study of the text, he will meet with more and more specimens of the same kind of editorial manipulation as that which has converted 'from the wâdy of Bĕsōr even to the wâdy of Mizraim' (or, as in 27^8, to the land of Mizraim) into a misplaced copy of the description in Gn 25^{18}. The editors often had to deal with indistinct and hardly intelligible words, and made the best sense of them that they could. Hence it comes to pass that many corrections of the text which, from a limited point of view, appear far-fetched are really more critical and more circumspectly made than apparently simpler and more plausible ones that do not go to the root of the matter, a circumstance referred to in a very different field by Professor York Powell in the introduction to that fine work, *Corpus Boreale Poeticum*. The reader will remark that I have contented myself with saying 'the wâdy of Mizraim.' I should have preferred to say, 'the wâdy of Mizrim,' for I do not believe that מצרים here means 'Egypt.' Those who are interested in the question, Are there references to a second מצרים in the Old Testament? (already raised, in connexion with Winckler's researches, in The Expository Times by Dr. John Taylor), will find my own affirmative answer given, and acted upon, in the Hebrew edition of *Isaiah* just appearing in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (p. 140, notes).

3. 1 K 10^{11} (R.V.)—

'Great plenty of almug trees and precious stones' (ואבן יקרה).

With reference to my 'study' on this and the parallel passages printed in The Expository Times, ix. (1898), pp. 470 ff., I may remark that it is possible to correct וְאֶבֶן יְקָרָה in v.[11] into לְקֹרוֹת אֶת־הַבָּתִּים 'to provide beams for the houses.' That v.[12] is not free from corruption has been shown by Klostermann; also I think I have shown that the almug timber probably did not come from India, but either from Elam or, not impossibly, from Hermon. That precious stones (E.V. for אבן יקרה in v.[11], Received Text), in the common sense of the phrase, were obtained in Lebanon or Hermon, is not known. 'Costly stones' for building may indeed have been got there. But the fact observed by a critical friend, that in 2 Ch 3^6, אבן יקרה has been written in error for הַקֹּרוֹת (also ויצף for ויחף) shows that it was very possible for יקרה and קרת to be confounded, and transposition and corruption together will account for the change of לקרות

[1] *Muṣri, Meluḫḫa, Ma'în*, ii. p. 6.

אבן יקרה into את־הבתים. Note that the narrator in Kings immediately proceeds to speak of the purpose to which the almug wood was applied in the temple; the details in v.[11] are, it is true, uncertain.

4. 1 Ch 29[2], אַבְנֵי שֹׁהַם 'onyx-stones' (E.V.). This does not come in very naturally in the list of building materials, with gold, silver, bronze, iron, wood. Apparently we should read שֵׁן וְהַבְנִים 'ivory and ebony,' cf. 1 K 10[22]. In that passage the Chronicler may (in spite of M.T. of 2 Ch 9[21]) have understood the ships of Tarshish to bring אבני שהם and not שנהבים (שן והבנים). Evidently the text of 1 K 10[22] has suffered much and varied distortion. But the archæological interest of the passage is such that we are compelled to use all our scanty resources for the removal of corruption.

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

The *Record* declares that the volume of *University Sermons* by the late Principal Caird of Glasgow, which Messrs. Maclehose have lately published, is the finest volume of sermons in modern English. For a moment it allows Dean Church's *Human Life and its Conditions* to challenge the pre-eminence, but after a moment it decides 'to rank the volume before us even higher than the splendid masterpieces of the Anglican divine.'

The Bible Society has been much exercised over the question of circulating the Revised Version. The opinion of leading Anglicans and Nonconformists was asked as to whether it would be wise now to circulate the Revised on the same footing as the Authorized Version. Archbishops, Deans, Canons, and others replied. Three hundred and sixty-two said Yes; but sixty-six said No, and so the decision has been deferred. Meantime, translations into other languages are made from the text underlying the Revised Version, and from the Revised Version itself, with the sanction of the Bible Society, and the complaint is made that the Bible Society grants to natives of India what it refuses to Englishmen resident there.

Theology is not dead. It has just given Professor Marcus Dods a sharp shock. He opened a book, the title of it, *An Outline of Christian Theology*. He opened it 'with a sigh of weariness and dread.' He found himself fascinated and enthralled, and compelled to read on to the last word.

Professor Dods observes that the interest of the book is not in novelty of doctrine. Its author, he says, is even severely orthodox in some respects, and in the essentials convincingly and enthusiastically orthodox. Its freshness lies in his truth to life and reality, and in his unconventionality. There is also, he says, a felicitous lightness of touch, combined with the most powerful grasp. The author is Professor Clarke of Colgate University, New York. Since its publication in this country last month, by T. & T. Clark, it has been discovered by others besides Dr. Dods, and seems likely to reach a larger circulation than any recent American book.

Our reviewer was surely in haste when he said that Dr. Llewellyn Davies was the Grand Old Man of Broad Churchism, and that the Broad Church movement would die with him. The Broad Church movement is determined not to die. A new society, called the Churchmen's Union, has just been formed, with the Rev. A. Boyd Carpenter as chairman, for the express purpose of keeping it alive. And Broad Church doctrine is to be attractively commended in the *Church Gazette*, of which the Rev. W. Routh is editor.

The *Church Gazette* has reached its second volume, and even got well on with it. As the *Record* on Nonconformity, and the *Church Times* on Roman Catholicism, so the *Church Gazette* is hard on Unitarianism, and tells this story: 'Twenty or thirty years ago—so writes a resident—Dr. Vance Smith, the distinguished Unitarian, was pastor of an endowed free chapel in St. Saviour Gate, York. Next door to the building stood the house of one of his personal and intimate friends—a man, however, who differed strongly from Dr. Smith on points of doctrine. It happened that this gentleman kept cocks and hens, which often made a noise during service. The learned pastor objected to these interruptions, and complained of them to his friend. He replied, "I'll stop it, doctor; you deny your Master, so I don't wonder you hate to hear the cock crow."'

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *American Journal of Theology* for the current quarter contains a review of the first volume of the new *Dictionary of the Bible*. The review is intrusted to thirteen scholars, each a specialist in his own department.

Professor Moore of Andover, well known in this country by his incomparable *Commentary on Judges*, opens with an article on the treatment of the Hebrew text. He adds some useful, if minute, particulars. Acco is read by the codices of the LXX in Jos 19^{30}, and by many scholars after Reland's conjecture in Mic 1^{10}; under ADAM (city) 1 K 7^{46} might be mentioned; and the like. Professor Edward Curtis of Yale has received the Hexateuch to examine. 'The aim of the writers throughout has been to give facts rather than theories, to be constructive rather than destructive, and thus to preserve and emphasize, as far as possible, the historical element of the Hexateuch, while freely allowing also the ideal or legendary element. There is a sober conservatism in their treatment, and yet an unflinching recognition of the demands of scientific scholarship.'

The post-exilic writings are examined by Professor Kent of Brown University. He is much pleased with Professor Francis Brown's treatment of the Books of Chronicles—'a thoroughness which is as surprising as it is admirable.' He is not so well pleased with Professor Batten on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. But these books are at present 'a storm centre for discussion and study,' and the final word cannot yet be spoken. We may add that whatever advance can be recorded since Professor Batten's article was written will be found in Dr. Barnes' article on the History of Israel.

But the reviews need not be further followed. They are capable, thoroughly honest and searching. And they have added some things of interest. On the other hand, they not only bear witness to the excellence of the Dictionary, but they also afford evidence of the difficulty of attaining to perfection. The writers of these reviews do not all keep within the bounds of their own department; or, rather, departments unavoidably overlap. And then it comes to pass, *e.g.*, that one reviewer expresses a qualified judgment on Forbes Robinson's 'Egyptian Versions,' another describes it as 'a model of thoroughness' and 'the best presentation of the subject in English.'

But indeed it is not possible for the most competent and careful reviewers to avoid mistakes in handling a work of such extent. There is an instructive review of the DICTIONARY in the current *Jewish Quarterly*. Two omissions are mentioned in the list of English words treated. One is the word 'beaten,' which is used of oil in Ex 27^{20}. The phrase occurs elsewhere, but it

is a literal translation always of the Hebrew, and therefore comes properly under the article OIL, not under the English word to 'beat.' The other is the expression 'all to break.' 'A cursory comparison,' says Mr. Jacobs, who signs the review, 'shows at once an absence of all explanation of the curious form "all to break" in Jg 9^{53}.' Perhaps the word 'cursory' is to blame. Mr. Jacobs may have looked only under BREAK. But that is not the important word, and under ALL will be found a full explanation of the phrase (which is printed in clarendon type to catch even the cursory eye), with illustrations from Tindale and Sir Thomas More.

Dr. Abraham Kuyper is a great theologian. He is described as the greatest living theologian in Holland. Professor Warfield of Princeton describes him, indeed, as 'probably to-day the most considerable figure in both political and ecclesiastical Holland.' A translation of Dr. Kuyper's greatest theological work—or at least of a portion of it—has been recently published in America and England. It is noticed on another page. Here we shall not speak either of him or of his theology. But we shall mention a single crucial example of his exegesis. And we shall remember that theology is built on exegesis.

It is the quotation in He 10^{5} of Ps 40^{6}. The words of the Psalm are: 'Mine ears hast Thou opened'; the words in Hebrews: 'A body hast Thou prepared me.' There is no doubt that it is a quotation, and Dr. Kuyper has no doubt that it is a quotation from the Septuagint version of the Psalm. The words of the Septuagint version and the words in Hebrews are in fact exactly the same (σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι). Moreover, Dr. Kuyper has no doubt that the Septuagint version, which the writer of Hebrews has taken over, is wrong. It was once right. Once it was ὦτα, that is, 'ears.' But ὦτα, 'ears,' got corrupted by some copyist into σῶμα, 'body.' So the present reading of the Septuagint is wrong. Yet its quotation in the Epistle to the Hebrews is not wrong.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews uses the corrupted Septuagint text, but he understands it in the sense of the original Hebrew. Or rather, for this is Dr. Kuyper's point, the Holy Ghost, who is the author of both passages, quotes the outward form of words with which the Hebrews were familiar, but quotes them in the sense which He originally intended them to carry. Now Dr. Kuyper thinks this is impossible if the ordinary German or English translation of the Psalm is right. That translation is: 'Mine ears hast Thou pierced.' It is impossible, he thinks, that 'a body hast Thou prepared me' can mean that. But that is not the right translation. That translation, says Dr. Kuyper, is absolutely untenable, because you could not pin *both* the ears of a slave to the door-post at once. Therefore, the only correct translation is, 'Mine ears hast Thou digged'; and 'digged' means 'opened'; and so the idea is the same in the Psalm and in the Epistle, 'Thou hast prepared me for the service of obedience.'

And if anyone should wonder why 'body' is put for 'ears,' Dr. Kuyper answers that it is so on the principle that the whole may at any time be put for the part. 'If my thumb is hurt, I can use three forms of expression: my *thumb* is wounded, my *finger* is wounded, or my *hand* is hurt. For "the preparation of the ear" can be put "the preparation of the body," provided both are taken in the physico-symbolical sense of spiritual obedience.'

Professor Robertson of Glasgow seems to be the only opponent of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament whom the critics now count worthy of reply. His latest book, *The Poetry and Religion of the Psalms*, is reviewed in the current number of the *Critical Review* by Canon Driver.

Canon Driver finds two weaknesses in the book. The first is that 'Professor Robertson's conclusions are apt to be in excess of what his premisses justify.' The other is, that, after all,

his conclusions are not out of touch with the conclusions of moderate criticism. Professor Robertson believes that we possess pre-exilic Psalms. So do moderate critics. He does not say how many, nor indicate which they are, and neither do moderate critics very confidently. He holds that there is nothing to hinder David from having been a Psalmist. Canon Driver quotes from Robertson Smith: 'We have every right, therefore, to conclude that the talents of Israel's most gifted singer were not withheld from the service of Jehovah,' and calls that 'a sentence which might have been written by Professor Robertson himself.'

Between the moderate critic (and Canon Driver is a moderate critic) and the opponent of criticism there is therefore no gulf fixed. There is scarcely even a river to cross. Perhaps Professor Robertson would seek no more than to restrain the moderate critic from becoming advanced. And Professor Driver is ready to recognize the courtesy as well as the scholarship of the effort.

In the long list of Old Testament names there is none that carries so strong an interest at present as the name of Zerubbabel. It is therefore probable that those who have first read Canon Driver's article in the *Critical Review* will turn next to Mr. Eaton's admirable account of Dr. Ernst Sellin's *Serubbabel*. They will certainly not be disappointed.

Dr. Sellin, who is Professor of Evangelical Theology in Wien, has adopted in the main the views of Kosters regarding the post-exilic history. For he finds that the current interpretation of that history leaves three questions unanswered. It does not explain how it came about that the exiles who returned in 538–536 B.C., who had neither a law nor a hierarchy, gave birth to the legal community of Ezra and Nehemiah. It does not explain why so many of the Psalmists despair of everything earthly, and sometimes almost of the mercy of God, while the contemporaries of Deutero-Isaiah and Zechariah look joyously and hopefully into the future. And it does not explain how two such heterogeneous streams as legalism and heart piety flow peacefully in the common river-bed of Judaism.

To these questions Dr. Sellin finds an answer in the new interpretation of the history. To all three questions he finds one answer. It is that under the influence of Haggai and Zechariah the people took Zerubbabel and made him king, but the Persians came and dethroned him, and he died a cruel death. The establishment of the Messianic kingdom under Zerubbabel was the occasion of all the religious joy and expectation. His overthrow was the cause of all the despair, and the open door for the entrance of legal worship.

Now Dr. Sellin admits that neither of Zerubbabel's enthronement nor of his overthrow is there a jot of direct historical evidence. But there is indirect evidence even in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The Persians, contrary to their principle, removed the governorship of Judæa from the royal house of David, so that Zerubbabel was the last of David's line. Was that not the result of rebellion? Again, when Hanani went to Shushan the palace to find Nehemiah, he said that the wall of Jerusalem was broken down (Neh 1^{3}). What wall was that? Not the original wall when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians 150 years before, for that was too old a story now. Nor any wall built by Ezra, for Nehemiah's first visit to Jerusalem was prior to that of Ezra. It must be a wall that Zerubbabel had built about the time they made him king. Then there is the letter of Rehum to the king of Persia. It is inserted in a wrong place (Ezr $4^{7ff.}$), but it is genuine, and cannot refer to any wall but one that was recently built. But the strongest arguments that Dr. Sellin produces are taken from the state of depression in which the community were found by Ezra and Nehemiah.

There was a kind of temple, but it had suffered some calamity. The prophets were discredited. And the Messianic expectation was so feeble that the Priests' Code, introduced by Ezra and Nehemiah, easily took its place.

But across this darkness Dr. Sellin sees one broad flash of light. In the midst of the nation's despair one religious genius retained his faith both in Providence and in prophecy. He is called Deutero-Isaiah, since we have nothing better to call him by. Deutero-Isaiah, Dr. Sellin believes, is the author of Is 40–55, and these chapters were written in Jerusalem after the Exile. Such passages as speak of the deliverance through Cyrus as still future are quotations from earlier prophecies of his own, and inserted here for a purpose. He wrote his great book between 515 and 500 B.C., that is, after the overthrow of the Zerubbabel Messianic monarchy, in order to comfort the people.

And the great comfort that he administers is in revealing the Servant of the Lord. Who is this Servant of the Lord? So far as he is not the people, says Dr. Sellin, but a definite individual, he is none other than Zerubbabel. 'Through the overthrow of Zerubbabel all their hopes seemed blasted. It was the sharpest crisis through which the religion of Israel had passed. But Deutero-Isaiah rises superior to this despair. His watchword is: the vocation of the Servant is not ended; he lives, he triumphs, he is the bearer of a covenant between God and His people that will never pass away; because of his wounds Israel is healed; he will see an innumerable seed; he will also enlighten the Gentiles, and will call them into his kingdom.'

The opening article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January is written by Professor Edward L. Curtis of Yale. Its title is 'The Outlook in Theology.' There is no surprise that such an article should be written by Professor Curtis, and we express no surprise that it has a place in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

Professor Curtis surveys the whole field. First he considers the general state of the Churches. 'Sometimes,' he says, 'old forms of belief become incorporated into the very structure of a denomination, so that a future growth in the knowledge and wisdom of God is apparently denied to its membership.' It has so fallen out, he believes, with the Greek and Roman Churches. He believes that these Churches have ceased to make any real contribution to religious thought. It is so falling out, he fears, with the Presbyterian Church of America. He trusts it will never so fall out with his own Congregational body.

Then he comes to the Bible. Professor Curtis is one of the most accomplished Old Testament students in America. He knows intimately what the scholarship of a hundred years has been doing with the Bible. Its work is nearly finished for the present, he believes. And he says that 'the general verdict of the Higher Criticism respecting the Old Testament will stand.' The opposing school appears to him a dissolving force. It produces no commanding literature. The Bible dictionaries, and even the commentaries, issued by leading publishers of scholarly, religious literature, present the new views. And the attacks which some archæologists have made upon special points have come to nothing—their own reconstructions of Old Testament history being fundamentally the same as those of the Higher Criticism.

The result is twofold. The Old Testament is reduced to the level of other ancient writings in respect both of its formal composition and also of its historical and scientific contents. But it is lifted far above them—is 'incomparably removed from them,' says Professor Curtis—as a record of Divine revelation and a promise of redemption. Henceforth there will be less attention given to the matter of composition. Attention will be fixed upon the revelation and the promise. The Higher Criticism will give place to what has happily been called the Highest Criticism, which

will preserve to the Church the Old Testament at its full value as a word of God.

With the New Testament it is otherwise. Criticism has still some work to do there. Controversy will continue for a time. Then it will be found that there are portions, even of the sayings of Christ, but especially the opening chapters of St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospels and of the Acts, which are less certainly historical than the rest. But after that, the Higher Criticism of the New Testament will again give place to its Highest Criticism, and its Divine message will be more distinctively and comprehensively revealed. That work has indeed begun already. Already the Highest Criticism has found in the New Testament a gospel for society as well as for the individual.

But what of Protestant Christianity? Professor Curtis says that the results of Biblical Criticism are radical and revolutionary. They have destroyed the infallibility of both the Old Testament and the New. Is not Protestant Christianity built upon an infallible Bible? Professor Curtis does not think so. 'The Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of Protestantism,' is true, but it must be understood. Orthodoxy has recently misunderstood it, and a whole chain of reasoning has been built on the misunderstanding. The miracle has been taken as the foremost evidence of revelation, especially the miracle of the resurrection. By the resurrection Jesus is proved Divine. Then Jesus authenticates the Old Testament by quoting it. He also authenticates the New Testament by the promise of the Spirit to the apostles. And when the apostles have spoken, the New Testament is complete. Accordingly, says recent orthodoxy, within the Bible thus authenticated, we find certain doctrines,—the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, justification by faith,—and we accept them because they are there.

But that is not the meaning of 'the Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of Protestantism.' And that is not the older Protestant position. The older Protestant position is that the primary witness to religious truth is the testimony of the Holy Spirit. 'If I am asked,' said that great Protestant, Professor Robertson Smith, 'why I receive Scripture as the Word of God, and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer with the Fathers of the Protestant Church, Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God; because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Christ Jesus, and declaring to us in Him His will for our salvation; and this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words unto my soul.' That is what is meant by 'the Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of the Protestant.'

It is his religion, because it is his only perfect rule of faith and life. But it is not the only source of revelation. Professor Curtis refers to Dr. Clarke's recent *Outline of Christian Theology*, and quotes the statement, 'The phenomena of nature make a real contribution to the knowledge of God, and theology must learn from them.' And he is bold to add that Christian revelation did not close with the New Testament canon, but is proceeding to-day. The revelation in Christ is known to us historically from the New Testament alone. But it is perpetually renewed to us. It is illuminated by the Spirit of God shining in our hearts. It is progressively amplified. It is adapted to new times and new conditions. 'Christians in every generation trusting in God may say, "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."'

It must not be said that the Broad Church is dead. It must not be said that it is on its deathbed. In England it has formed itself into an association and started a newspaper. In Scotland,

just a little later, it has done the same. The association in Scotland is called the National Church Union; its organ is *Saint Andrew*. The second number of *Saint Andrew* has just appeared. It contains a verbatim report of the proceedings at the second annual conference of the National Church Union.

The proceedings of the National Church Union at its second annual conference may be read with steady interest and scarce a touch of pain. It was felt by some of the members that the chairman, who was the Rev. Dr. Glasse of Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, went out of his way to crack up the High Church movement. It must surely have been felt by many that the Rev. J. Murray, M.A., of Kilmalcolm, had set out on an impossible enterprise when he sought to show that Christianity would do quite well without the miraculous. But Dr. Glasse explained his own position, and said that he 'never for a single moment cracked up High Churchism against Broad Churchism, but wanted to point out that the Society took up a tolerant attitude.' And Mr. Murray was so harmless when he remained general, and so incredible when he became particular, that his paper passed. And so the meeting dispersed with a sense that the Church was not conscious of its full obligation to the children—the Rev. David Watson's paper made that clear; and that textual criticism had something very disturbing to say about the Lord's Supper—Professor Menzies of St. Andrews made that clear.

Professor Menzies said that his paper was intended to be a report of the great discussion that is going on in Germany about the Lord's Supper. The discussion started in 1891, with a paper by Professor Harnack in the *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Harnack produced evidence from some obscure sects and even from Justin Martyr, a representative of the practice at Rome in the middle of the second century, that in the celebration of the Supper in the early Church water was sometimes substituted for wine; and he argued that our Lord laid no stress on the particular substance. Either leavened or unleavened bread would do, and either wine or water.

The argument was at once attacked. It was not denied that certain sects used water for wine, nor even that such a usage could be traced for several centuries. But this was not considered sufficient to prove that wine or water was a matter of indifference either to the Church or to Christ. Harnack's views on that point are not likely, says Professor Menzies, to prevail.

That, however, was but the starting-point for a discussion of deeper consequence and wider range. What did our Lord say, and what did He do on that night in which He was betrayed? The whole question arose as to the accuracy of the varying narratives and their relation to one another. Professor Menzies gave a translation of the narratives, and we had better reproduce it here.

MARK xiv. 22–25.

And as they were eating, He took a loaf and said the blessing, and broke it and gave it to them, and said, Take, this is My body. And He took a cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And He said to them, This is My covenant-blood, which is shed for many. Verily I say to you, I will never drink again of the fruit of the vine till that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

MATT. xxvi. 26–29.

And as they were eating, Jesus took a loaf and said the blessing, and broke it and gave it to His disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is My body. And He took a cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink of it, all of you; for this is My covenant-blood, which is shed for many, for forgiveness of sins. But I tell you I will not drink henceforward of this fruit of the vine, till that day when I drink it with you new in the kingdom of My Father.

ST. PAUL (1 Cor. xi. 23–25).

For I received from the Lord, what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was given up, took a loaf, and after giving thanks, broke it, and said, This is My body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of Me. In the same way also the cup

after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in My blood; this do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.

LUKE xxii. 17–20.

(*a*) In Codex D (Cantabrigiensis).

(17) And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, divide it among yourselves; (18) for I say to you, from henceforth I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. (19) And he took a loaf and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, This is My body.

(*b*) In the Vatican Codex B.

(17) And He took a cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves. (18) For I say to you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. (19) And He took a loaf and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, This is My body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me. And the cup in the same way after supper, saying, This cup, the new covenant in My blood, poured out for you.

Well, the first question is, Have we here four accounts or only three? Westcott and Hort depart for once from their beloved Vatican and follow the Cambridge Codex D. According to Codex D, St. Luke has practically no account of the institution of the Supper. Professor Blass, who believes in Codex D, says quite plainly that it has been omitted by St. Luke, just as it has been omitted by St. John. Thus we have only three. But the weight of authority in Germany has gone the other way. It is held that the end of ver. 19 and all ver. 20, as we find them in our Authorized Version, ought to stand. And so we have four different narratives after all.

Now when these four different accounts are placed together they are seen to fall into two groups. St. Matthew and St. Mark agree together against St. Luke and St. Paul. The first two say, 'This is My body,' the second two add 'which is for you.' To the word 'covenant' in St. Matthew and St. Mark, St. Luke and St. Paul add the adjective 'new.' They also add the sentence, 'This do in remembrance of Me,' and they say that the new covenant is 'in' or 'by means of' Christ's blood.

Next, when St. Luke and St. Paul are compared together, it is clear that St. Paul is the earlier, and Professor Menzies thinks it probable that St. Luke is dependent upon St. Paul. St. Luke, it is true, has the phrase 'shed for you,' which is not given by St. Paul. But it comes somewhat awkwardly into the grammar of the sentence, and may have crept in from the other Gospels. The Sinaitic Syriac version omits it. In any case, St. Luke can hardly be independent of the narrative in First Corinthians, which was written so much earlier. Then Professor Menzies believes that St. Mark's account is the original of St. Matthew's. And so we have but two accounts finally to compare, a short and simple narrative in St. Mark, and a larger, more elaborate narrative from St. Paul.

Professor Menzies ventures to compare these two narratives carefully. The first question is, Where did St. Paul obtain his narrative? He says he received it from the Lord. Professor Menzies does not understand that to mean that it came to him as a direct revelation. It means, he thinks, that the apostle claims more for it than his own personal authority, that it is a tradition which he possesses in common with the Christians of the older Churches. The Lord was its ultimate source, but the channel may have been the apostles, especially St. Peter, whom he knew best.

And it is from St. Peter that St. Mark's account comes also. For the saying of Papias that St. Mark wrote down St. Peter's recollections is meeting with much acceptance now. Whereupon we find ourselves in this position. The oldest and most independent accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper may both be traced to the reminiscences of St. Peter.

So the great differences between the narratives of St. Mark and 1 Corinthians are due to the master-mind of St. Paul. 'St. Mark is a historian who deals in carefully treasured reminiscence. He does not compose freely, but repro-

duces materials furnished to him in various ways, adding to them, no doubt, in many passages, some arrangement and colour of his own, but in the passage before us giving surely the exact words of his source. St. Paul, on the other hand, comes before us as a Church statesman, who has practical ends to serve in the Churches he has founded, and who holds very strongly a doctrine which he regards as the one and only gospel.' St. Paul, therefore, makes certain changes on the original tradition. The changes are made in the line of his doctrine, and in the interests of a fuller church service. The words 'took,' 'blessed,' 'broke' are here, but he omits the word 'gave'; for the worshippers are not required to carry their thoughts back to the Galilæan disciples. 'A cup' is changed into 'the cup,' and it is placed after supper, for it is no longer a part of the common meal, but a separate religious rite. More important, 'Take, this is My body' becomes 'This is My body for you,' a doctrinal change in accordance with 'my gospel.' And most important of all, the words 'This do in remembrance of Me' are added, whereby the simple family meal of St. Mark, in which no repetition or commemoration was thought of, is converted into a memorial observance on the part of the Christian Church after the pattern of the Passover.

Professor Menzies does not say that he himself believes it was St. Paul who converted the simple family meal of St. Mark into the Lord's Supper. He says it is the view that has found best support in Germany, and he quotes Weizsäcker, Jülicher, and Spitta in its favour. He says that it is a view surrounded with great difficulties, and that he has not yet determined to adopt it. But he says that in any case this controversy will never have any influence on the celebration of the Lord's Supper in our Churches. 'Whether the Lord founded the ordinance consciously or unconsciously, whether the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me," proceeded first from Jesus on earth or from Christ in heaven, He is the founder of the ordinance, and we shall use these words.'

But he also says that inasmuch as the New Testament lays down no strict ritual of the Lord's Supper, those Christians who appeal to the New Testament as the standard of their religion, 'are free themselves, and must allow liberty to others, to connect with the acts done in the ordinance such views and doctrines as appear to them most true and most in accordance with the spirit of their Master, so long as due regard is paid to reverence and order and charity.'

Dr. Petavel on Immortality.

By the Rev. Frank Ballard, M.A., B.Sc., Hull.

If one should rush to interfere between two such disputants as Dr. Beet and Dr. Petavel, there would appear just cause for indictment on the ground of presumption. Inasmuch, however, as the letter addressed by the latter to the former was avowedly an 'open' one, it may be assumed that every Christian teacher at least was also desired to ponder its contents. I trust, therefore, that no apology is necessary for venturing to differ from some of the findings of the esteemed Continental divine who thus publicly asks an English professor to go 'one step further.' So many backward steps seem to some of us necessary, before Dr. Petavel's standpoint could be reached, that just now, when many and vigorous attempts are being made to revive a heresy which the consensus of Christendom long ago dismissed as unworthy, any one may be forgiven a sincere attempt to contribute to truth upon a question of such grave importance.

The whole question of Conditional Immortality is confessedly too vast to be taken in hand in a few pages of a magazine. So inevitable was the reaction in the popular mind from the ghastly

monstrosities which formed a large part of evangelical appeals during the last century, that one cannot wonder at the number of those in almost all the Churches to-day, who think that they have found relief from the dire mysteries of eschatology's dark side in the doctrine of 'Life in Christ' as interpreted by Conditionalism. I have the greatest sympathy with such reaction, having felt it intensely myself years ago. It is only because close and prolonged examination proved the fair promise to be but a mocking mirage, leading to a drearier desert of contradiction and despair, that I am constrained to utter my respectful but profound amazement at the total surrender of his case against Conditionalism by one of our best known exegetes. When Dr. Beet avows, 'I do not find, either within or without the Bible, any clear disproof of, or serious objection to, Dr. Petavel's teaching,' I can scarcely credit the sight of my own eyes. To many minds the 'serious objection' to Dr. Petavel's teaching is emphatically twofold. (1) The absence of positive proof, as Dr. Beet rightly says. But when he concedes with this the absence also of disproof, he appears to me to overlook the most influential of all reasons for declining Conditionalism, viz.: (2) the presence of disproof so manifest and weighty, that, in spite of the estimable names which cluster around the doctrine of Mr. White, and the sincere vigour of the propaganda now proceeding on its behalf, it remains an insoluble problem how any trained Christian intelligence can for a moment entertain it.

I must ask pardon for suggesting that the position of Dr. Beet in his reply is not logically defensible. He has found in the Bible 'no serious objection to Dr. Petavel's teaching,' and yet, 'on these matters the Scriptures as I read them give no decisive judgment.' I fancy this will not satisfy Dr. Petavel. For it is the very soul of his 'teaching' that the Scriptures do give a 'decisive judgment,' and that on behalf of final annihilation. Surely it is a serious objection to refuse to acknowledge the main contention of an opponent. At all events here, in a few words, without pretending to embark upon the whole theme of Conditionalism as represented by its recent advocates, I wish to express my serious objections to some of the statements and attitudes adopted by the esteemed Professor who calls upon us to follow him in the direction indicated in his 'open letter.'

On p. 409, then, of this magazine for June, we are told that 'separated from the source of life, the sinner is advancing by a slow and funereal march towards eternal death,' that is, 'deprived of essential immortality, the soul cannot but eventually cease to be.' This is said, moreover, to be a 'main distinction' between 'the essential immortality of the soul and the ultimate extinction of the lost.' It is difficult to appreciate. Assuming the writer's perfect knowledge of English, it rather concedes the main point at issue. For we cannot conceive of any man's being 'deprived' of what he did not already possess. Whence it must follow that the sinner was in possession of 'essential immortality,' and was only deprived of it, as Washington was deprived of his hatchet, for his persistent sinfulness. But it would certainly seem to be the affirmation of the writer everywhere else, that a sinful man does not possess essential immortality. Which of these avowals is true? If the sinner is not 'essentially immortal,' (the word 'essential' is not mine) then he cannot, even gradually, be 'deprived' of immortality. If, however, he can be deprived of it, then he already possesses it, in spite of his sinfulness. It will require a powerful microscope to discover the distinction between such loss of essential immortality and ultimate extinction.

But these words demand further consideration, for they are fairly typical of Conditional fallacies. 'Separated from the source of life, the sinner slowly advances towards eternal death.' It is necessary to know what we mean. What 'life' is this, and what 'death'? What 'separation' is involved, and what does this 'slow march' betoken? Such questions must be plainly asked and definitely answered. That this 'life' cannot be physical existence is manifest. The sinner is no more separated from God, as the Author of his being, than the saint. If, however, we are here to understand spiritual life, as distinct from physical existence, then also the death to which its loss leads, must similarly be spiritual death. To call it 'eternal,' and signify thereby the extinction of being, is a pure *petitio principii*. Spiritual life is a quality of soul; personal extinction is the cessation of a quantity of consciousness, utterly irrespective of quality. It is therefore necessarily fallacious to argue from the one to the other.

Yet again. How can one who is 'separated from the source of life' advance in any direction?

If he be separated from life, he is dead. If he be living enough to 'advance,' then he is not separated from life. That he should be already separated from the source of life, and yet only gradually and eventually cease to be, is one of the illogical assumptions with which Conditionalism abounds. 'It is only a question of time,' says Dr. Petavel. But it will require a longer time than even eternity supplies, to develop cessation of being out of that spiritual depravity the very essence of which is persistence in the misuse of being.

Dr. Petavel endeavours to prove his contention by metaphors. 'Separated from its source the river cannot but dry up; separated from the tree the branch cannot but wither: both the river and the branch are gradually brought to nought.' Now on the next page Dr. Petavel strongly objects to Dr. Beet's metaphor of a 'ruin'—'because it is inadequate, being taken from the domain of architecture, while man belongs to the organic and spiritual world.' May we ask, then, if a river belongs to the organic world, or a tree to the spiritual? If not, then these metaphors of Dr. Petavel are quite as 'unsafe and inadequate' as he insists that of a ruin to be.

On p. 409, again, second column, Dr. Petavel affirms that a 'possibly indefinite perpetuation of the existence' of human souls is 'against the positive teaching of the New Testament.' He adds that, 'according to the explicit declarations of the Apostle Paul, God only is immortal (1 Ti 6^{16}, Ro 1^{23}).' Is this, however, either what Paul said, or what he meant, in these passages? I submit that it is not. In 1 Ti 6^{16} ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν is not adequately rendered by 'God only is immortal.' Nor is the inference at all warranted that because God only hath immortality, therefore men are only mortal. That this is a definite fallacy of the consequent, may be learnt even from the preceding verse, where the apostle speaks of God as ὁ μόνος δυνάστης. That no man is or can be a 'potentate,' would be just as fair an inference as Dr. Petavel's. Again, in Ro 1^{23} ἀφθάρτου warrants no inference as to the exclusion of human immortality by reason of the Divine. The 'likeness of an image of corruptible man' rather, by contrast, suggests the 'let us make man in our image, after our likeness' of Gn 1^{26}. But if Dr. Petavel will have it that ἀφθάρτου means simply possessed of everlasting existence, I must remind him that then Conditionalism is flatly contradicted by the Apostle Paul in 1 Co 15^{52}, where he affirms that the dead shall be raised ἄφθαρτοι. How universal is the resurrection in-

au
Chris
ponde
apolo
som
divi
to g

ded, we learn unmistakably, not only from the ostle in the context, but also from Christ's own rds in Jn 5^{28}.

The statement that in 1 Jn 2^{17} the Greek word μένει 'brings out nothing but the ontological notion of duration, in contradistinction with a lessedness which is only an attribute or a characteristic of that endless existence,' is but an assertion all too typical of Conditional methods, unwarranted by the text, unsupported by the context, and contradicted by the whole trend of New Testament teaching. This attempt to reduce the robust antithesis of the apostle to a mere skeleton of continued colourless existence, is sufficiently rebuked by the employment of the same term in the same chapter, as well as in other places. Into the use, for instance, of this term μένει in vv.$^{27, 28}$ read the sense: 'Nothing but the ontological notion of duration,' and what is left us of the 'maturest thought' of the New Testament? Apply the same to the next chapter, vv. $^{15, 17, 24}$, or to such passages as Jn $14^{10, 17}$ and 15^{4-10}, etc. It is a strange gospel indeed which has to establish itself upon the mere shells of benedictions which are essentially rich and full.

In the next paragraph we find a still more misleading assertion. It is certainly well that we should have from Conditionalism the acknowledgment that 'no doubt the only immortal God can render imperishable anyone or anything He pleases,' but I scarcely know how respectfully to characterize what follows. 'The writers of the New Testament have taken express care to limit His promise of doing so to those who "seek immortality."' The calm question-begging tone of this is only equalled by the falsity of the exegesis. That the writer well knows the Greek term in Ro 2^{7}, we may, of course, assume. Is, then, Dr. Petavel prepared to assert that the ἀφθαρσίαν found here, is neither more nor less than a synonym for the ἀθανασίαν of 1 Ti 6^{16}? If so, let us try it in Ep 6^{24}, where the same word occurs. 'Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in'—everlasting existence! Even the old version 'sincerity' was better than that, but the Revised more exactly renders 'uncorruptness.' Are we reminded of 1 Co 15? I am most willing that the word should there be faithfully interpreted by the total manifest meaning of the apostle in vv.$^{35-52}$. But if Conditionalism insists that 'it is raised in incorruption' means simply imperishable, seeing that 'immortality' is asserted as the rendering in Ro 2^{7}, I can but point out once more that this settles the whole case against the Conditionalist, inasmuch as a few verses below we are categorically told that the dead, *i.e.* 'all that are in the tombs,' shall be raised—'immortal.' That, therefore, ends the controversy.

However, in order to do utmost justice to Dr. Petavel, let us proceed. The next passage referred to is 2 P 1^{4}. Here again we are definitely given to understand that to 'become partakers of the Divine nature' is to become immortal. But why does Conditionalism quote the first half of a sentence to suit its purpose, and leave unnoticed the other half, which is not only inseparable but manifestly intended by the writer to make clear

what he meant by the former half? 'Having escaped from the corruption which is in the world by lust.' Can any words of human speech show more unequivocally that the writer was thinking of moral and spiritual quality, and not at all of duration of existence? Nothing would be easier than to confirm this from the rest of the New Testament. But it is surely superfluous to show that the likeness to their Master which Christians are ever urged to cultivate, is likeness in character, not continuation in being. I affirm deliberately that there is not one single passage which can honestly be interpreted as meaning the latter, whilst we all know that the 'new creation,' with its accompanying spiritual change, is insisted on everywhere.

Again, p. 410, 'All other beings are subject to the universal law of decay.' By way of illustrating this, we are reminded that it is said of the heavens, 'They shall perish, they shall wax old as a garment.' If, however, the thought of the writer here was that 'perish' simply meant annihilation, it is hard to see how that which was annihilated could at the same time 'wax old.' Moreover, seeing how emphatically the metaphor of a 'ruin' has just been rejected by Dr. Petavel, it is somewhat remarkable to find him endeavouring to substantiate the annihilation of human souls by appeal to 'architectural ruins.' The truth of the case is, that neither the heavens nor architectural ruins yield any fair analogy to human souls. Whilst as to 'all other beings,' the Bible contains no hint whatever of any comparison of them to men. So far as that moral and spiritual world with which the Bible deals is concerned, there might as well be no 'other beings' at all. To say, therefore, that 'human souls are not exempt from the operation of this universal and invincible law of decay' is after all only sheer assertion of the thing to be proved, under the guise of a false analogy.

Again, we are told that 'their ultimate extinction must be hastened if they are left to be preyed upon by sin as by a deadly disease.' Here once more it is quietly assumed that sin is an ontological disease affecting the quantity of a man's being, whereas everywhere in Scripture it is regarded as a spiritual malady degrading its quality. This might suit the modern materialist whose creed is 'Ohne Phosphor kein Gedanke,' but it is in no sense Christian.

'Considering the universal law of decay, want of proof as to immortality is presumptive evidence of ultimate annihilation.' This 'want of proof,' again, is simple assertion. It may be perfectly sincere on Dr. Petavel's part, but why should he thus sweepingly assume that, *e.g.*, all that Dr. Welldon has just written is absolutely false and worthless? To say nothing of the deep and strong convictions of scholars and thinkers throughout Christendom who cannot be quoted for number. But about this 'universal law of decay,' which we have seen is only by false analogy universal enough to include the human soul? Decay of what? If sin be decay at all, it is, according to Scripture, moral and spiritual decay. By what right does Dr. Petavel represent such as gradual diminution in the quantity of being? With all respect, it seems to me that 'the *onus probandi* rests with' him to justify an assumption which is contrary alike to logic and to Scripture.

A little lower down on the same page (411, first column) we read: 'Its remains are no more a structure than the ashes of a bank-note that has been entirely burnt up are a bank-note. Passing now from the metaphor to the human relics, of which it is a symbol, what is there in the nature of things to prevent their ruin from becoming similarly the end of their existence?' I answer, in the writer's own words, this, that the metaphor employed is 'unbiblical, defective, inadequate, misleading.' A 'bank-note' it seems, is so utterly similar to a human soul that the degradation of the latter, through sin — that is, through wilful choice of known evil—must be on all fours with that which happens to a bank-note when it is burnt to ashes! As to 'the nature of things,' it is not a question of things at all, but of the nature of the human soul. It is pure assumption to liken the moral ruin of a human spirit to the consumption of a bank-note.

Again, we are asked why 'the wisdom of the Creator' should 'maintain the existence of useless human ruins?' 'How can you reconcile with the wisdom of God the endless maintenance of a worthless being?' Here we pass from assumption to presumption. It is going equally beyond revelation and the range of our faculties, to assert that impenitent souls hereafter will be 'useless' and 'worthless.' Moreover, it certainly is not the valid test of Christian theology that we should be ever able to reconcile this or that with the wisdom of God. A gnat bent on settling the quadrature of the circle would be a fair parallel. Has Dr. Petavel reconciled with the wisdom of God the existence of evil at all, or the dreadfulness of this world's present mystery of pain?

It does not follow that if human wrecks remain conscious hereafter 'thus would be restored the endlessness of torment.' For it is not 'torment,' in the old cruel repulsive sense, that a man should reap what he has sown; and the absolute endlessness of such reaping is beyond the vista of what is revealed to us in Scripture. That which can be revealed to the limited human mind concerning the nature and will of the God of the whole universe, is not sufficient, nor ever can be, to make us dogmatically sure of the possibilities of literal eternity.

One wonders, indeed, that 'so judicious and penetrating a mind' as Dr. Petavel's, 'should be

content with an untenable position.' Doubly and trebly untenable it is in very truth. For whilst the 'figment of an inherent and indefeasible immortality,' that is manifestly, a self-endowed and absolutely indestructible potentiality of being, is but a figment of the writer's imagination, disowned by all reasonable orthodoxy and set up only to be cast down, it is utterly illogical to argue the case of human souls in the infinitely distant future from a forced analogy to rivers, architectural ruins, and bank-notes. Whilst it is Conditionalism alone which really makes into a 'lie' the original warning, 'In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' For even if, to oblige those Conditionalists who appear to be pledged alike to verbal inspiration and the literal acceptance of the opening chapters of Genesis, we take that first narrative as simple history, the one thing clear above all else is that those who then sinned did not then die, in the Conditionalist sense, inasmuch as they continued to live.

The rest of the 'open letter' with which we are dealing, concerns itself more especially with the well-worn theme of the significance of the words 'destroy' and 'death,' with their cognates. The calm way in which Dr. Petavel, after the fashion of Conditionalism, asserts that 'Paul did not believe in the essential immortality of the soul' and adds a 'therefore,' would be amusing if the theme were only less serious. But to track out every fallacy in these paragraphs would require many more pages than are at our disposal. When we attempt to summarize, the first thing to be noted is the concession that 'the word destruction does not always mean total and final extinction.' It is interesting to find this illustrated from the letter of a French officer, who wrote: 'If we are destroyed, I shall keep even beyond death the regret of our failure.' This may be commended, with Dr. Petavel's imprimatur, to Conditionalists of the Constable school. But the question to be settled is whether the term, as applied to the future of the impenitent, means, or does not mean, total and final extinction. All the interesting distinctions into 'comprehensive and relative,' 'culminative and putative' are in a sense irrelevant. And we must be permitted to decline the new commentary which asserts that the prodigal son was not 'lost,' it was 'only a case of supposed loss or death.' Also that Paul meant simple annihilation in 1 Co 15^{18}. Or that the 'lost sheep' of the House of Israel were 'rather misled than lost.' Nor may we acknowledge that 'the withering of a corruptible crown cannot but bring the crown to an end in time'—therefore—the human soul must be withered to an end in eternity. And when it is remarked that 'sin has a tendency to extinguish even the intelligence of perverted men,' and that 'folly is only a few degrees remote from a complete extinction of the intellect,' we can but pronounce it an utter fallacy of the consequent, to infer that, therefore, sin must also issue in the annihilation of the human soul. Not only does the logic limp, but the analogy breaks down.

But as to the production of evidence by quotation from Scripture, is it of any avail? I have before me, as I write, a carefully examined list of not less than a hundred and twenty passages where are found the Hebrew and Greek terms corresponding to the notion of destruction, such as are rendered 'destroy,' 'perish,' 'utterly destroy,' 'devour,' 'consume,' 'cut off,' 'blot out,' etc. But when one is informed that an 'array of quotations is a skein easily unwound when begun at the right end of the thread,' one knows that the significance of all such passages is settled to begin with. It is, therefore, useless to allege them. An example is supplied us in the reference to 2 Thes 1^{9}. This, we are told, is 'slightly pleonastic, in order to accentuate the idea of an abiding and endless result, an unrestricted destruction. It is, therefore, a perfect synonym of our dialectical word annihilation.' The meaning of the apostle is thus brought out by reading annihilation in. Is this justified, even upon a *prima facie* examination? We are given to understand emphatically that ὄλεθρον means extinction. It is equally insisted that ἀιώνιον means everlasting, or endless. The meaning of the two terms together, therefore, is 'everlasting extinction.' But I submit that this is not even thinkable. If the destruction be everlasting, it is not extinction. If it be extinction it cannot be endless, seeing that the very essence of the notion of extinction is an end. To speak of it as a pleonasm, to aver that it is the 'result of the destruction' that is endless, is but a verbal evasion in order to avoid a logical consequence.

Very much the same applies to the employment of the term 'death.' Only here the fallacies of Conditionalism become even more conspicuous, by reason of the clear force of the antithesis with the term 'life,' as applied to human salvation through Jesus Christ.

Here again, however, it would be unavailing to produce a catena of texts. I, too, with Dr. Petavel, 'have taken into minute consideration every passage of the Bible in which the words relating to death occur, and have classified these passages.' My conclusion is the exact opposite of his. But as two only are here noticed, we will confine our attention to these.

In Ro 6^{23} we are told that the meaning is 'absolutely unrestricted and exhaustive. Just as the physical death puts an end to all the sensations and all the activities of the body, so the perseverance in sin will ultimately put an end to all the feelings and all the activities of both soul and body.' That is to say, perseverance in evil

must issue in the loss of the power to do evil. Is this either Scripture or moral philosophy? Is it either experience or observation? I affirm that it is contrary to all four. We are told just above by the Doctor that 'there is for man a physical and spiritual death.' With this we shall all perforce agree. Now, however, we are given to understand that there is a third death—'absolute death,' the essence of which is extinction, 'whereof the physical and spiritual death are only forerunners.' But seeing that we do know that neither physical nor spiritual death mean human extinction, (for it is quite another thing to say that physical death puts an end to the activities of the body), we have to ask where and how this ontological change is wrought which makes the third death absolutely different from its 'forerunners.' As a matter of fact, it is the purest assumption to read this significance into the apostle's words. The rest of the chapter is quite sufficient witness to the unwarrantableness of the attempt to drag in here the notion of extinction hereafter. The death contemplated is spiritual, and the consequences are spiritual. Sin is indeed never a bodily act; the body is but the tool of the spirit, and the wages of sin must ultimately be spiritual. If we are sure of anything from modern science, we are that physical death was in this world before human sin, even as we also know that many of those who are least sinful, and—if there be any value in Christian faith at all, are actually forgiven—succumb, when we want them most, to a premature physical death.

To avow that 'the physical life has no more any existence if its feelings and activities have absolutely ceased,' is somewhat of a truism. But to infer that 'in a similar manner the life of a soul will exist no more when the second death shall have put an end to all its energies' is a double fallacy. For the last half of the sentence assumes the very thing to be proved, whilst the first half assumes that the life of the soul is in all respects similar to the life of the body. Which it is not.

But let us turn to the other passage quoted, in order that the truth may be elucidated by antithesis. It is not a question of gradualness at all, but of essence. Love may die gradually, even as a tree may. It does not follow that they are the same in essence. By contrast we may learn from Paul what he means by death—'but the gift of God is eternal life.' Is it a true interpretation to render this as everlasting existence? I, for one, earnestly protest that it is not. The passage quoted (1 Ti 6^{19}) is unfortunate, to say the least. To regard 'the life which is life indeed' as meaning merely, or even mainly, that 'they may make sure of everlasting existence' is but a travesty of the ideal intended. Much more truthfully does Ellicott say, 'That life in Christ which begins indeed here, but is perfected hereafter.' If, however, it be possible in human speech to make clear and fix for ever the true significance of any expression, one would have thought that, for all who acknowledge the authority of the Gospel and Epistles of John, the significance of the apostolic phrase in Ro 6^{23} had been put past controversy. Amongst the last and most emphatic words of Christ recorded by the beloved disciple, we have (Jn 17^{3}) these: 'That whatsoever Thou hast given Him, to them He should give eternal life. And *this is life eternal*, that they should know Thee the only true God, and Him whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ.' Nor can there be any doubt that it was with this in mind and heart that the apostle wrote also in his Epistle (1 Jn 5^{20}): 'The Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life.' With these words as an incontrovertible starting-point, it would be easy to arrange all the occurrences of this potent phrase under four heads: (1) those which speak of eternal life as a present reality and possession, with no reference at all to continued existence after death; (2) those which signify a definite, qualitative, soul reality, in which quantitative immortality, or everlastingness, is both secondary and assumed; (3) passages with the double significance, the present spiritual life in Christ being always the main assertion; and (4) occurrences which, whilst manifestly future in their reference, yet undeniably assume all the present reality of spiritual possession. If the combined force of all these does not suffice to show by antithesis what is the New Testament significance of 'eternal death,' further discussion seems useless.

In conclusion, therefore, it is not the name 'Conditional Immortality' to which we object. It is that the doctrines thereby signified are not true, so far as that can be decided by full and fair exegesis of the New Testament. We may have, verily, quite as strong a revulsion of feeling against the ghastly things which have been said and taught under the doctrine of 'eternal torments' as Dr. Petavel. But how he or any Conditionalist can find 'relief' afforded, or any 'punishment tempered with mercy,' when the actualities and consequences of annihilation are faced, is past comprehension.

One might also be permitted to defer judgment until we know which really is Conditionalism, that represented by Mr. White in his well-known book, or that of Mr. Constable and others, which directly contradicts Mr. White in matters most essential, and was by him definitely stigmatized to me years ago as a 'crazy school.' Before men can take the 'step further' which Dr. Petavel so

earnestly and doubtless sincerely desires, they must know whether they are to accept Mr. Constable's dictum, that 'by having a soul, or being a living soul, in the case of man, the very same thing is meant as in the case of the lower creatures.' Or again, in other words, 'we affirm that the soul of man is nothing more or less than that animal life which he shares in common with the beasts.' It will, moreover, certainly be necessary to decide which is right—for they are diametric contradictions—for the assertions of the Constable school that 'death is the annihilation of man, his hopes, his thoughts, his life, himself,' so that after death the state of man is 'one of loss of all existence, both of soul and body'; and during the intermediate state 'the soul of every man has no existence'—or the emphatic denial of all this in chap. xxi. of Mr. White's book, summarized as it is in his own conclusion that 'the general doctrine of the Bible, that a spirit survives in man's death, seems to outlast all the attacks of its opponents.' When this is settled, we shall be in a position to estimate the logical consequences of either doctrine as regards ultimate annihilation.

To know Mr. White was to revere him; nor can anyone read the concluding sentences of Dr. Petavel's 'open letter' without being touched by the tender sincerity which glows in every line. But in our present state of being, at all events, neither sincerity nor zeal can ever be the test of truth. Some of the most mischievous mistakes and deadly errors in all religion and philosophy have been sincere. And when we read our venerable friend's avowal, that those who believe in human immortality 'seem to forget that Christ has called Himself the Bread of Life, the Water of Life, which are symbols not of enjoyment, or even of holiness, but of ontological maintenance and support,' we can but marvel that it should be possible to one so able and so good, to come contentedly to a conclusion which, the New Testament being its own witness, reduces the promise of present, fullest, and highest life to mere prolongation of future existence, eviscerates the doctrine of Christian holiness, puts man—whom even the Old Covenant declares to be 'little less than God'—on a level with the beast, and instead of relieving the dark mysteries of eschatology, makes them lurid and even ghastly with anticipations of Divine wantonness and despair worse than mediæval travesties.

We agree with Dr. Petavel that a 'reformed eschatology' is urgently needed for a more successful advocacy of the Christian faith, but as to Conditionalism—*non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis*. Many, many steps, and those retrogressive, will have to be taken before the Christian world will be brought into line with those who, though moved by the best intentions, would jettison the dignity of manhood, contemning its deepest and highest instincts; would belittle the character of God; and make the creation of our race to have been only a Divine mistake, which redemption vainly endeavoured to retrieve. Our Conditionalist friends, therefore, must forgive us if, while we 'bear them witness that they have a zeal for God,' we add that it is 'not according to knowledge,' and decline to take even 'one step' in such downgrade direction.

Requests and Replies.

I have read with interest, in the last number of *The Expository Times*, Professor Hommel's article on the newly published list of early Babylonian kings, and his vindication of the biblical chronology, which he connects with it. I am at a loss, however, how to reconcile his view with a statement of Professor Sayce's in *The Expository Times* for January, p. 172. According to Professor Hommel, the Pharaoh of the Exodus was Amenophis II. (*c.* 1461–1436 B.C.); according to Professor Sayce, the question 'has been set at rest by Dr. Naville's excavations on the site of Pithom,' that Ramses II. (1324–1258 B.C.) was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, which would make his successor, Merenptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Thus in the date which they assign to the Exodus, these two authorities differ by just two centuries; and a question which one affirms to have been 'set at rest' by the progress of archæology, is by the other declared to be still perfectly open. Can any of your readers tell me how I may reconcile these apparently contradictory opinions?—INQUIRER.

The following is Principal Rainy's reply (published with his permission) to a private request of an old pupil for guidance towards the best literature on the Lord's Supper:—

For the patristic and mediæval views, which are not perhaps essential to your object, but with which still one should be acquainted, I don't know that one need go beyond Gieseler, who is reliable. But I understand you want to keep to the Reformation and post-Reformation discussions. For what precedes that, Baur's *Dogmengeschichte* may be

added to Gieseler if it falls in your way (Posthumous, 4 vols.).

The fundamental history for the later time is Hospinian's *Historia Sacramentaria*. It is old-fashioned, but quite worth consulting. Naturally, he leans to favouring his own side, but, I believe, is honest in the main. You get there the whole *detail* down to the end of the sixteenth century.

For the Roman view, the *Decrees of the Council of Trent* and the *Catechismus Romanus* are authoritative. The decree of the great Lateran on transubstantiation you have in Hospinian.

You ought to have, in addition, if you wish to go deep into it, some weighty Romish controversialist; for this reason, that you get there correctly the shades of view of different Romanists on points not decided authoritatively, and also the prevalent opinion of their theologians. For that reason, instead of Bellarmine, or any writer of that date, it is better to have a trustworthy modern. I find Perrone's *Prælectiones* very useful, the rather that they are primarily intended for their own students.

For the Lutheran view, any collection of the Lutheran symbolical books: Tittmann, Hase, or Meyer. Their view is set forth at much length in the *Formula Concordiæ* and in the *Epitome*. I should recommend also *Luther's Theologie*, by Köstlin. He is a fair-minded man. A brief statement, dogmatically, for the purposes of theological instruction, may be found in a hundred books. Leonard Hutter's *Compendium Locorum Theologicorum* could be got, I should think, for one shilling. Hase's remarkable *Hutterus Redivivus* would cost perhaps two shillings.

The most convenient place in which to find Zwingli's own words is the *Collection of Reformed Confessions*; but I don't think there is anything there very detailed about the Lord's Supper. Christoffel's *Life* (translated) can be got from the libraries. Of course all Zwingli's treatises are in his collected works, but that is cumbrous. You get much of him in Hospinian.

In Niemeyer's *Collection of Reformed Confessions* you have the 'Consensus Tigurinus,' which represents Calvin's view as acceded to by the divines of Zurich. It is a very good statement of what Calvin's followers then saw their way to. It hardly represents sharply enough Calvin's personal way of thinking on the subject. For that, besides the *Institutio*, you should consult the tract 'De Coena Domini,' in the eighth volume, I think, of the Amsterdam edition of his works. That will prepare you for Cunningham's article, which of course you know, in *Reformers and Theology of the Reformation*.

As regards the Church of England, there have been floods of books, many of them most unhelpful. I should say it might be wisest to begin with Waterland's *Review of Opinions*, and then Goode's *Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist*; after that you can decide whether it is necessary to go any further. What Hooker says in the *Eccl. Polity*, bk. v., ought to be read. Of decidedly advanced books, I suppose Pusey's *Doctrine of the Real Presence* and R. I. Wilberforce's *Doctrine of the Eucharist* are as representative as any.

ROBERT RAINY.

Edinburgh.

The Massoretical note at the end of the Minor Prophets (as published by S. Baer, 1878, p. 102) states—

> Anni libri sunt trecenti et viginti septem anni, ab *Usia* rege ad annum quo venit *Alexander*.

Five years ago (*Materialien*, 1893, p. 23) I called it strange that none of the Introductions to the Old Testament mentions this statement or gives an explanation of it. Nor have I yet got any fresh light in the meantime. May I now ask through the columns of *The Expository Times*—

How old is this statement?

How is it to be understood?

Are there any traces, besides, that the time of Malachi was fixed as late as Alexander?

How is it possible to reckon from Usia (his first or last year) up to Alexander 327 years? Must the figure be changed, or do we have here another example of incorrect computation? comp. Bevan on Daniel ix. (p. 148). The question is not indifferent, just because of the seventy weeks of Daniel.

Where can I find any light on this curious statement?—EB. NESTLE.

IT was not in 1878 that this Massoretic note was first published anew, for it may be read also in the Grammatico-Massoretic Compendium issued in the year 1871 by Joseph Derenbourg under the title *Manuel du lecteur*. The note is given on p. 135. It also appears after 1878 in the *Dikdûkê*

ha-ṭe'amîm (ediderunt Baer et Strack, 1879), § 70. Here it runs—

ספר הושע בן בארי הוא ספר שנים עשר
נביאים שלש מאות ועשרים ושבע שנים
מן עזיהו המלך עד השנה שבא אלכסנדר
עד כאן נתנבאו הנביאים בבית שני בימי
דריוש וארתחשסתא ובטלה הנבואה:

Accordingly, this statement was long familiar to me, and in my *Einleitung* (p. 459) may be found the words 'in dem interessanten § 70 von *Dikdûkê*, etc. (Jahre der alttestamentlichen Bücher).' But the full terms of this section could not be added to the numerous Massoretic and Rabbinical materials contained in my *Einleitung*. The words just quoted were supposed to be sufficient for the O.T. student, and there are many similar hints in my book, which, extremely full as it is, had to be kept from swelling beyond due bounds. The question of Dr. Nestle now gives me the opportunity to discuss in more detail the above tradition.

1. The *age* of the statement can, in my opinion, be determined only *in*directly and merely approximately. It is found neither in the Talmud nor in the Midrashîm, and one does not meet with it in Jul. Fürst's work, *Der Kanon des A.T. nach den Ueberlieferungen im Talmud und Midrasch*. One might, indeed, suppose that the same statement occurred in *Seder 'olam rabba*, cap. 30, because Baer remarks on the words השנה שבא אלכסנדר, 'so also in *Seder 'olam rabba*, cap. 30.' (This work is attributed, although upon uncertain grounds, to Jose bar Chalephta, the teacher of Judah the Holy, the redactor of the Mishna.) But the words of *Seder o. r.* (ed. Meyer, p. 90) neither contain anything regarding the 327 years, nor have they in view the book of the Twelve Prophets, but, as is expressly added, refer to והצפיר השעיר וג', *i.e.* to Dn 8^{21} $11^{3f.}$. Hence the note of *Seder o. r.* is not substantially identical with the questionable statement of the Massoretes. But the note which is read, as we have seen, in § 70 of *Dikdûkê haṭe'amîm* and elsewhere, stands in the well-known Codex prophetarum Babylonicus Petripolitanus (written in the years 1008–1010 A.D.; cf. *Dikdûkê*, p. xxiv f.), fol. 465. Whether other sources, from which Baer and Strack have derived the statement, date from an earlier period, cannot be determined with certainty.

2. What is the *meaning* of the words? It is very natural to ask, first of all, in what sense were they understood formerly? But in the helps accessible to me, I find no mention of the 327 years. They are absent alike in *Seder 'olam rabba* and *Seder 'olam zuṭa* (written *c.* 800 A.D. [?]. It may be noted that זוטא, 'parvus = minor,' is generally transcribed *zuṭa* [Buxtorf, זוּטָא], but Dalman [*Aram.-Neuheb. Wörterb.* 1897, *s.v.*] points זוֹטָא, *zoṭa*). Nor does Joh. Meyer in his copious notes on these two works (pp. 121–1144) mention those 327 years. Hence I had almost despaired of a solution of the question, when I discovered that in *Seder 'olam zuṭa* it is said regarding Uzziah that he began to reign in the year 3115 after the creation of the world (ed. Meyer, p. 104: התחיל למלוך שנת ג' אלפי' ק"טו). Further, on p. 108 it is related that 'in the 18th (י"ח) year of the rulers of the Medes, which is the 70th year after the destruction of the temple (586–516), Ezra the scribe and other exiles with him journeyed to Jerusalem, and he built the wall of Jerusalem and set up (והכין) the house of the sanctuary (? 516), and Zerubbabel returned (וחזר) to Babylon and died there, and after him there rose up his son Meshullam, and in his days began the dominion of the Greeks, (namely) in the year 52 (נ"ב) of the Medes and Persians, which is the year 3442 since the creation of the world, and there died Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.' (The activity of these three prophets is assigned to *the same* period also in the words, 'Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi prophesied in the second year of Darius' [*Seder o. r.*, ch. 20, ed. Meyer, p. 55].) Now, if one counts from 3115 to 3442, one obtains the 327 years of the Massoretic note we are discussing.

The correctness of this solution of the question is confirmed by the circumstance that not only in § 70 of *Dikdûkê*, but also in *Seder 'olam zuṭa*, after the words cited above, reference is made to the *cessation of prophecy*, and *immediately thereafter* comes the sentence, '*Alexander* the Macedonian, the king of Greece, reigned 12 years (אלכסנדרוס מוקדון מלך יון מלך י"ב שנה), and there died Meshullam, the son of Zerubbabel.'

3. From the above it is clear (*a*) that the duration of the Persian Empire was contracted to a period of 52 years, and (*b*) that Malachi was placed at a point of time near to Alexander.

(*a*) The first point comes out no less clearly in the following passages: the three kings announced to the Persians in Dn 11^{2} are in *Seder o. r.* (ch. 28,

p. 84) identified with Cyrus, Ahasuerus, and Darius (שלשה וג' זה כורש ואחשורוש ודריוש). Further, it is remarked that the Persian dominion 'in the presence of the temple' comprised 34 years (*Seder o. r.*, ch. 30, p. 91: מלכות פרס בפני הבית שלשים וד' שנה). Hence in the words, 'the sum of the years of the kings of Persia and Media is 250 years' (ch. 30), Meyer (pp. 89, 1142) rightly recognizes a typographical error (חמשים ומאתים instead of ח' ושתים). He might, it appears to me, have reached this conclusion simply from the arrangement of the words.

(*b*) Other 'traces that the time of Malachi was fixed as late as Alexander' have not been found by me in the more recent works (the *Einleitungen* of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hävernick, *et al.*, the Commentaries, etc.). But L. Cappellus was of opinion that Malachi prophesied after the 22nd year of Artaxerxes Mnemon (405–361 B.C.), and before the 1st year of Ptolemy Euergetes (246–221) [*Opera posthuma*, p. 178; Wähner, *Antiquitates Ebræorum*, i. p. 65]. Further, Joh. Meyer (p. 1085) remarks, 'Malachiam nonnulli putant haud diu ante Christum floruisse.' This rests, of course, upon the supposition that the prediction, 'the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple' (Mal 3^{1}) must been uttered not long before the advent of Christ. But Meyer has already rightly opposed this late date for Malachi in the words, 'quod verisimile non videtur, quia tempore Maccabæorum destituti erant prophetis (1 Mac 4^{46} 9^{27} 14^{41}).'

4. Such a *contraction of a longer period* might happen all the more readily, the less information there was regarding it (cf. Chwolson, *Corpus inscr. Heb.*, col. 486). In the same way the years 701–681 are in Tob $1^{18\text{-}21}$ contracted to πεντήκοντα (*var. lect.* τεσσαράκοντα) ἡμέραι (cf. Fritzsche, *Libri apocr.* pp. 110, 113). Compare also Ex 12^{40} (according to which the Hebrews sojourned 430 years in Egypt) with Gal 3^{17} (according to which they were 430 years in Canaan *and* Egypt). It is self-evident that this characteristic of the chronological knowledge of the Jews helps to explain the Book of Daniel, and especially the 70 sevens (less properly 'weeks') of years (cf. regarding the internal value of this external uncertainty of the data of the Book of Daniel, my *Einleitung*, p. 390). Moreover, I have been for long struck with the circumstance that alongside of the plur. *shābū'ōth* (Ex 34^{22}, Nu 28^{26}, Dt $16^{9f.\ 16}$, Jer 5^{24}, Ezk 45^{21}, 2 Ch 8^{13} [all]) the form *shābū'îm* is found only in the Book of Daniel, 6 times ($9^{24.\ 25a.\ b.\ 26}$ $10^{2b.\ 3b}$), and that it is always written without ו. Hence for many years I have cherished the notion that this plural form has a double source in the author's circle of ideas. In the first place, this orthography is intended to prevent *literal* weeks being thought of. Secondly, the constant form שָׁבֻעִים is meant to indicate that these *shābū'îm* represent simply an amplified form of the round number שִׁבְעִים (*shib'îm*, 'seventy') of Jer 25^{11} and 29^{10}.

ED. KÖNIG.

Rostock.

Sacramental Hospitality.

BY THE REV. JAMES WELLS, D.D., GLASGOW.

In a previous article (on 'Bible Hospitality') I showed that the wonderful hospitality of Bible times has been stereotyped among those Palestinian Arabs of to-day, who have not been touched by European influences. I also gave some specimens of the expository helps offered to us by these new-old customs. My plan was, and is, to lay alongside of each other the heavenly medallion and the earthly mould in which it was fashioned. I am now to exhibit four of the incandescent side-lights which Arab hospitality—ancient and modern—sheds upon the Lord's Supper. The very best thing in Oriental life has been utilized by Christ as an image of the very best of God's gifts to man.

I. *The Lord's Supper is a Reconciliation Feast.*—Schumacher (see his *Across the Jordan*), when selecting the route for the railway which is to connect Damascus, the Sea of Galilee, and Haifa, often came into collision with the chiefs. When they wished to come to terms with him, they made what they called 'a reconciliation feast,'

and invited him to it. To decline their invitation was practically a declaration of war between them and the Sultan; to accept the invitation was a complete assurance of friendship. This flashes a welcome gleam of fresh light upon many a Bible page. It is one of the root-ideas in the Lord's Supper; in the parables about feasts; and also, though not so obviously, in the Passover. True, it does not explicitly present the idea of sacrifice or atonement. As in the meeting of Laban and Jacob at Mizpah, the eating of bread is the sign and seal of a covenant. God's saints are defined in Ps 50^5 as those who have made a covenant with Him by sacrifice. A traveller tells that when he neared the summit of the great St. Bernard Pass, he first saw the cross and then the hospice; and he adds finely, 'Yes, we find God's hospitality at the Cross.' To eat food offered to idols is to be identified with them in the strongest possible way; it is to be partakers of their altar, and to 'have fellowship with devils' (1 Co 10^{16-20}). The worshipper has become the spiritual guest of, and so been 'brothered' with, these idols. By parity of reason, the communicant shares at the Lord's Table the covenant-hospitality of God, and enters into close mystic union with Him.

The conditions of this high privilege are not hard. In explaining this sacred object-lesson, we fix our eyes upon the object that we may not miss the lesson. If an enemy only touches a rope of his foe's tent, he is safe. 'Now the past is past,' said an Arab to Bruce, with whom he had quarrelled, after they had drunk coffee together. The covenant is sealed even by eating one morsel of a chief's bread; amity is pledged by drinking one mouthful of his water. When Rob Roy was at the Lake of Merom, he was made a prisoner by the thievish Arabs there. They seized his canoe, and carried it to their tents. But his wit was level with the occasion, and executed a fine stroke of diplomacy. The Arabs are very fond of sweetmeats. The Jews of Tiberias turn this weakness into merchandise. They carry sweetmeats among the Arabs, and barter them for such goods as they possess. But the Gentile for once surpassed the Jew in ingenuity. He took a tin box out of his pocket, and began to swallow its contents, smacking his lips with evident relish. The chief's fondness for sweets moved him to take a pinch out of the box. He put it to his lips, and lo, it was salt! Rob Roy had outwitted the thieves, and gained the protection of Arab hospitality. His canoe was restored, and he was treated as an honoured guest. I have also read that a robber in the dark stumbled over a piece of rock-salt, tasted it, and at once gave up his booty.

And Arab hospitality would lose its charms and value if its welcome were limited. The Arab here is in accord with the ancient Greek. Admetus, in the Alcestis of Euripides, gives 'guest-welcome' to Herakles, though his wife lay a corpse. He was afraid that his palace should be called 'Guest-hating Hall.' 'Guest-fain was he; guest-fain over much,' says the poet. He must show 'pity towards strangers.' Even escaped criminals can claim hospitality; no chief can deny it, even to his deadliest enemy when he flees to him. A friend was dining one day in the tent of a chief near Jericho. A man sprang in, seized a bit of bread, and ate it. There was a blood-feud between that man and the chief; and by that act the poor fellow, from being a foe, became the guest of the man who was seeking his life. Any enemy may become a friend by choosing to be a guest, and may also secure for himself the first place in the tent. The Arab must welcome all comers.

Is heaven's hospitality poorer than earth's? Can the drop be as great as the ocean? Is God less generous than Abraham or Abraham's modern descendants?

II. *The Lord's Supper is a Brotherly Feast.*—Communicants are fellow-guests who sign and seal their covenant with God, and with one another.

Arab hospitality, in this respect, abounds with great spiritual suggestions. 'The bread and the salt make all brothers,' an Arab said to Doughty. 'We have eaten salt together' is still the strongest bond of friendship. Some renew the bond every twenty-four hours lest it should grow weak. Burton speaks of 'salt-law' and 'terms of salt.' The Arabs define their relation to their guests by such beautiful phrases as 'brother-share' and 'brother-help.' Their eating together is accepted by all as a sacrament of union and brotherly love. A fellow-guest who betrays or injures is called 'an abuser of the salt'; this is the most stinging taunt among the Arabs; it emphasizes what they hold to be the most monstrous baseness.

Perhaps the weakest point in average modern Christianity is its slender recognition of the bonds of Christian brotherhood. By its lowly ministering

brotherly love in a loveless age, the faith of Christ conquered the heathen world, and we must have a revival of this spirit before we can witness similar triumphs. The ideal of Arab hospitality vividly places before us the perfection of Christian brotherhood. In its light we can better understand the sacramental teachings about brotherly love. 'For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread' (1 Co 10^{17}).

Like the Passover, the Supper is a family meal, and the hour when the family feeling reaches its fullest consciousness. Every guest is a fellow-child of our Father in heaven. 'I am your brother and companion,' St. John says. Companion means literally bread-fellow (*con* and *panis*). According to De Quincey, the name *Free Masons* comes from the word *mess*: they are mess-fellows or bread-fellows. To be a bread-fellow or a cup-fellow, binds the Arab to every social duty which is pressed upon us in the New Testament: it even pledges him, if need be, to die for his comrade. I believe that Christ and His apostles laid their hands upon these well-known usages, and consecrated them to evangelical and sacramental uses. Were this understood and practised, our church-life would be revolutionized, and the world would be impressed as it never yet has been.

III. *The Lord's Supper is a Satisfying Feast.*—The Arab does his utmost to secure that all his guests shall be safe and satisfied. As we have seen, the Arab's deadliest enemy is safe in his tent. It is said that the Sultan could not force a refugee from the tent of his host except by exterminating the whole tribe. The protection given even to an enemy is all the more remarkable as blood-revenge is the Arab's idol. It is not only a most sacred duty, it is also, in the absence of a settled government, the only protection of life. Without this wild justice might would everywhere be right. The 23rd Psalm (v.^{5}) illustrates this point: 'Thou preparest a table for me in the presence of mine enemies.'

The avenger has pursued the shedder of blood, who casts himself on the hospitality of a powerful chief. He is welcomed, of course. His pursuers halt; they are now powerless to injure the fugitive; the host, like Abraham, spreads a table 'under the tree,' and royally entertains his guest; his baffled enemies can only gnash their teeth and pass away.

And the guest is satisfied. For the laws of hospitality oblige the host to supply the every want of the humblest guest. The claims of such a guest on his host are stronger than those created by blood or affinity. Christ's washing of the disciples' feet comes under the category of hospitality. The guest becomes a member of the family, and much more than that. He is for the time the lord of the tent, and all in it is at his disposal. If hitherto an enemy, he receives much more than bare reconciliation.

Salvation and satisfaction are the two leading ideas in the Lord's Supper. Christ has so arranged it, that though it represents His death of pain and shame, all its symbols are refined and delightful, and are, in this respect, in marked contrast to the Passover. This striking difference is in manifest harmony with the genius of the New Covenant. The Supper is vastly more than a fitful and doubtful vision of the holy grail. The cup of blessing is the symbol of the most real enjoyment. It symbolizes 'the remission of sins,' and it is called 'a feast,' not a meal. It does not offer paupers' rations or prisoners' fare. Bread and wine represent both the necessaries and the luxuries of life. They who partake of it are satisfied with the abundant goodness of God's house. Man at God's table doth eat angels' food, even though it be mixed with the 'bitter herbs' of penitence for sin and lost sacramental honour. Christ meets our crave for light, pardon, rest, strength, solace, and immortality. Thus the noblest hunger of the soul is appeased.

This line of exposition lights up and restores the faded metaphors in many familiar texts. It also emphasizes the fact that the Lord's Supper is essentially a feast, not the offering of a sacrifice for sin. It is presented on a table, not on an altar. There is no transforming magic in the act of consecration. 'The cup which *we* bless,' St. Paul says; the act of blessing is the act of the whole flock through their representative. 'The bread which we break,' he adds; it remains bread after it has been consecrated and broken. It is interesting to read in the *Life of Lord Tennyson*, that when in his bedroom he received the Lord's Supper shortly before his death, he explained to the clergyman that he could partake of it only on the understanding that it was not a mass, but a communion; not a sacrifice, but a life-giving feast.

IV. *The Lord's Supper is the Symbol of an Eternal*

Feast.—It is more than a mere viaticum or provision for our journey. It is, as the old divines called it, the pledge and earnest, the prologue and infancy of immortality. 'I am a stranger with thee,' says David (Ps 39^{12}), 'and a sojourner, as all my fathers were.' We may thus paraphrase these words: 'I have come to Thy door, and cast myself upon Thy hospitality and protection. In danger of becoming the outcast of both worlds, I appeal to Thee for guest privileges.' The words might also be supposed to hint at hereditary hospitality, as the son of a guest had special claims.

'Go in peace,' said a chief to M. Schumacher (*Across the Jordan*, p. 115), 'you have eaten bread and salt with me. Our friendship shall last for ever. You will always be safe, for Muhammed Es Senir with his life guarantees yours.'

Among the Greeks and Romans salt and hospitality were synonymous. Among Orientals salt, by reason of its preciousness and its preserving virtue, is the most prized element in a feast. It is the accepted symbol of eternity. A 'covenant of salt' thus means an unalterable and everlasting covenant. Such a covenant has mystic and indefinite significations, and thus shadows forth the marriage supper of the Lamb in heaven.

Biblical hospitality thus suggests the permanency of the great gospel feast. 'For even Christ our Paschal Lamb has been sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast' (1 Co $5^{7.8}$). This means that life is to be an unbroken banquet, as the relation formed by Christ's death is not one that is to be severed: God's guest is to sit every day at the table of the great King. And the feast stretches into eternity, for the communion table is to be prolonged from the upper room at Jerusalem to heaven itself. To be God's guest-friend once is to be His guest-friend for ever. The 23rd Psalm exults in this truth, 'Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.' These bold words mean that the Psalmist has guest-rights worthy of his Host; he has been welcomed into Jehovah's tent, and in Jehovah's tent he shall remain for ever. The same great truth is rehearsed in John's vision of heaven. 'He that sitteth on the throne shall spread His tabernacle over them' (R.V.); that is, they shall be Jehovah's guests. Therefore, 'they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat.' Hunger and thirst and fatigue under the merciless sun are the evils which afflict the traveller, and from all of which he is delivered in the most grateful resting-place which his entertainer has prepared for him. All these phrases are carried up from the earthly life to the heavenly. 'For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.'

That would be the very perfection of Divine hospitality. Again, we read (Rev $21^{3.4}$), 'And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle (literally the tent) of God is with men; He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain.' The hospitality is worthy of the Host: God's guests receive God-like entertainment.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS v. 24.

'And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.'

EXPOSITION.

'Enoch walked with God.'—This is translated in the LXX, 'Enoch pleased God,' whence comes the 'testimony' quoted in Heb 11^{5}. Really it gives the cause of which the Greek phrase is the effect; for it denotes a steady continuance in well-doing, and a life spent in the immediate presence of and in constant communion with God.—PAYNE-SMITH.

HIS mind was pure; his spirit rose above the turmoil of worldliness; he delighted in calm communion with God; once more the familiar intercourse between God and man, which had existed in the time of Paradise, was restored; the path commenced by Seth was continued by Enoch; the former addressed God by the medium of the *word*; the latter approached Him by the still more spiritual medium

of *thought*; the highest form of religious life was gained: but, unfortunately Enoch alone 'walked with God'; his contemporaries were sunk in iniquity and depravation, but the measure of their wickedness was not yet complete; three generations more were required to mature their destruction; and God, in order to rescue Enoch took him to Himself, delivering him from the contamination of his time at a comparatively early period of his life.—KALISCH.

'And he was not.'—On a sudden he was gone, without sickness, without dying, without burial; for Elohim had taken him, *i.e.* removed him from this visible world and taken him to Himself, and hence to a higher life. Not that he was made a participator of the glory which awaits the righteous at the resurrection. Christ, who was the first to rise, was also the first to be glorified. The glorification of Enoch would deprive Him of the precedence, and the translation of Enoch to the heaven of God and the angels, would deprive Him of the honour of having opened to men the heaven, in which no Old Testament visions show us yet any holy human being. God translated him from this world of sin and sorrow without letting him be subject to death, into a condition which resembled the lost Paradise. He thus exempted him from the law of death or the return to dust, showing thereby that though He had subjected men to this law, He had not bound Himself to it.—DELITZSCH.

'For God took him.'—Instead of the mournful refrain *and he died*, coming like a surprise at the end of each of these protracted lives, we have here an early removal into another world, suggesting already that long life was not the highest form of blessing; and this removal is without pain, decay, or death, into the immediate presence of God. Thus one of Adam's posterity after the Fall succeeded in doing, though doubtless not without special help and blessing from the Almighty, that wherein Adam in Paradise had failed. We learn, too, from Jude vv.[14. 15], that Enoch's was a removal from prevailing evil to happiness secured.—PAYNE-SMITH.

THE reason of his being taken away is not that he was liable to declension, as if he were to be preserved from falling back into sin, but, according to the first part of the verse, because of God's complete satisfaction with him. It is the highest distinction of piety, which the Old Testament acknowledges only to Elijah besides, and in direct contrast to the being swallowed alive by the earth (cf. Nu 16).—DILLMANN.

WE are convinced that the 'taking away' of Enoch is one of the strongest proofs of the belief in a future state prevailing among the Hebrews; without this belief the history of Enoch is a perfect mystery, a hieroglyph without a clue, a commencement without an end. If, then, pious men could hope to continue a brighter existence after their transitory sojourn upon earth, the books of the Old Testament are not enveloped in the gloomy clouds of despair; they radiate in the beams of hope; and, if a long life on earth was also gratefully accepted as a high, though not the highest boon, this may have sprung from the just feeling, that man is born to enjoy and to work, to receive much and to give more; and that he does not deserve the blessing of eternal rest before he has toiled to extend the empire of truth and piety.—KALISCH.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Walking with God.

By the Rev. John Thomas, M.A.

This is one of the briefest and most comprehensive biographies ever written. When we consider the early stage in the history of the world at which the record appears, the marvellous distinction given to this man, the deep spiritual conception and hope involved in the words, are startling. Here in this dry list of births and deaths, in this wide expanse of starless sky, suddenly there shines a blazing luminary that compels your attention. One was born, lived, and died; another's history follows in the same terms, then all at once, as a matter of course, with comment or mark of incredulity, Enoch appears on the scene, and this is the record of his life.

1. *Enoch's character.*—Let one's conception of inspiration, or of this narrative from a literary point of view be what it may, this must have been a marvellous man, to be singled out for such a biography. He must have entered into a profounder realization of the Divine than his contemporaries. He seems to me to have been a great-eyed prophet, a great-souled seer—a man who went out under the midnight sky, and felt the infinite, touched the eternal, was bathed in the presence of God. Men looked at him, felt that there was a soul in him, a consciousness of the Divine in him which they did not possess, and he stood out a giant among them. His life was a poem. Browning makes Aprile say in his *Paracelsus*, 'God is the perfect poet, who in His person acts His own creations.' And this Enoch was Godlike enough to be a poet, acting in his own person the poetry of life. The poet is the man that sees the real, the eternal, the beautiful, in the centre of things, and thus Enoch's life was a living poem. He walked with God. The world around him was full of celestial visions. The divine, holy pure, Godlike life is the only poetry. All else is bald and barren prose.

And Enoch was also a prophet. Whether he uttered the very words attributed to him by Jude or not, he was a prophet. His heart was full of God, and he was bound to speak His message to the world. That does not mean that he had nothing to do with the human life around him.

His walking with God was recognized through his relations with men. His life crossed the path of man as an ideal, an inspiration, an assertion of divine possibility, and to a great extent a guarantee of human immortality. The man that walks with God, that brings a new inspiration and ideal into human life, must touch life at every point. It was not enough that Enoch should repair to his chamber, and realize a divine atmosphere all around him. Men could not recognize such walking with God. He must have come into the very midst of their life, giving it a new impulse, must have poured new, rich, human blood into it, purified by the prophetic power God had given him.

2. *The impression made by his life.*—His contemporaries recognized that he had a more intimate fellowship with God than they. Not by his severing himself from their life, nor by his ostentatious prayers. The Pharisees tried to give the idea that they were in close fellowship with God, but failed to impress the people round them as Enoch did, because their life was barren. Those that walk *with* God must walk *like* God. God does not sit in the heavens removed from the needs and sorrows of men. His dwelling is with the sons of men, and the man who walks with God must find His companionship as He walks through the earth to help the poor and needy. It is by service we are purified. But we must touch human life with holy hands, bring the glory of heaven down into it, do all things from the divinest and noblest standpoint. So Enoch touched the world with the glory of the skies. So he walked with God.

3. *The explanation of his disappearance.*—This proves the marvellous impression made by his life. Enoch one day or one night goes forth, and is not seen again. He goes to commune with God, as he had done many a time. He went out to fellowship, to solitude and prayer; and next morning there was the great sky and the earth beneath, but the man was gone. 'God has taken him,' they said. Why not say, The man is dead? But this people would reply to such a suggestion, That man with those divine ideals, with God manifest in him cannot die; he lives for ever in the God that kindled the fires of holiness and power in him. The explanation was not less wonderful than convincing and true. Paul has the same argument with reference to Jesus Christ. Enoch came upon the history of his time with a new revelation, and the most marvellous part of it perhaps was this conviction of human immortality. He gave his age the certainty, as far as he was concerned, of immortality; he gave men a new hope and a larger inspiration. As soon as they lost him they knew he could not die; probably not till then, for the full significance of a noble life is rarely realized till we have lost it. The prophet is only half understood as we rub shoulder to shoulder with him. Even to His disciples Christ said, 'It is expedient for you that I go away.' And so God glorifies Himself in His servants in their death as well as in their life.

II.

The Christian Life a Walk.

By the Rev. J. P. Lilley, M.A.

1. The first aspect of the Christian life which this figure suggests is that it is a life begun in connexion with a public profession. A man who goes out to walk does so in the face of the world. He moves in the consciousness that his course is scanned by many unseen by him. So from the moment we take the side of Christ men are scrutinizing us, and in the case of those who are still natural men, never in a friendly mood. God is our chief spectator; but it would spare us much humiliation if we remembered that the world is watching us too. It is doubtless to remind us of this that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are both public acts. If the Christian life had been merely a hidden tie with God these rites would have been celebrated in secret. The fact that they are held in open day binds us to carry our Christian life into the open air, and make it a walk that men can see.

2. This figure reminds us that the Christian life has a definite goal in view. When you go to walk you like to fix upon the place to which you are going before you set out. When a man becomes a child of God he begins to desire that he may finally go to God. There is a promise that this longing shall be fully satisfied (Jn 14^{2-4}). We rest upon this promise, and move forward to its fulfilment.

3. The Christian life is to be a life of dauntless spirit and energy. We must walk with the steady onward march of a soldier, who, at the general's command, has to go up hill or down dale, or across

meadow, or swamp, or moor, till the spot is reached where the camp is to be set. As Dr. Candlish says, life is 'not a random flight, or a groping, creeping, grovelling crawl, or a mazy labyrinthian puzzle; but a steady walk; an onward march and movement; a businesslike purposelike step-by-step advance in front—such a walk as a man girds himself for and shoes himself for, and sets out upon with staff in hand, and firm-set face, and cap well fixed on the head; and holds on in, amid stormy wind and drifting snow; resolute to have it finished and to reach the goal.' So the Christian life is an enterprise that has to be carried out with prudent forethought, and those who do not remember this will never achieve any high results for their own spiritual character or the conversion of others. We must tread many a rocky road, climb many a steep hill, descend many a giddy slope, creep through many a narrow gorge of trial and humiliation; and to nerve us for this nothing will suffice but the resolute spirit that will do and dare and endure all things that God may be glorified, the soul saved, and the world won.

4. This life can only be lived in union with God, and in the strength which He alone is able to impart. Enoch walked *with* God because he walked *in* God. Even Jesus walked as He did, because he was God's Son and filled with His Spirit. If, therefore, you are eager to enter on this life, see that you first come to God for grace and strength. 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' No, and no more can you, except you first be pardoned by God, and received into His holy household. Take these steps by an instant consent of the heart to the saving power of the living Christ, and then for you too the gate of this blessed pathway is as instantly open.

Illustrations.

Great men it has been said have short biographies. So is it with Enoch. He is the greatest figure of that old world, head and shoulders above all the antediluvians, yet his was the shortest life of all. The number of his outward years does not attain to the number of the years of his fathers; there is less to tell of him than of them. Why is there less to tell? It is because he is greater than they. His life was more inward, and therefore it was more hidden. The part that lived most intensely was just the part which men do not see—the spirit, the heart, the soul. His life was hid with God, because in its essence it was the life of God-love. It was too inward a life to make an impression on the world; its walk was divine, and therefore it was deemed a lowly walk, a thing to be forgotten. Yet nothing else has been remembered in all that world. Its wars and rumours of wars, its marryings and givings in marriage, its buyings and sellings, and banquetings have been numbered with the dead; but Enoch, by his walk with God, is alive for evermore.—G. Matheson.

The mysterious figure of Enoch has given occasion to Jews and Christians for further explanations and fancies. In Sir. 44^{16}, he is described as 'an example of repentance to these generations.' In the Book of Enoch and in Jude $^{14f.}$ he is spoken of as a seer and prophet who, by preaching repentance, prepared for the judgment of the Flood. In virtue of his intercourse with the higher world he was regarded as participating in occult knowledge, as possessor of deeper insight into the things of heaven and earth, especially as discoverer of and expert in astronomy and arithmetic. He also figures as clerk of court and chancellor of heaven. Books were written in his name. His name was interpreted 'initiated or expert,' and passed over to the Moslems in the synonymous name Idris (scholar). —Dillmann.

A Gentleman died very suddenly and his jester ran to the other servants, and having told them that their master was dead, he, with much gravity said, 'And where is he gone?' The servants replied, 'Why to heaven to be sure.' 'No,' said the jester, 'he is not gone to heaven I am certain.' The others with much warmth asked him how he knew his master was not gone to heaven. The jester replied, 'Because heaven is a great way off, and I never knew my master take a long journey in his life, but he always talked of it some time beforehand, and also made preparations for it; but I never heard him talk about heaven, nor ever saw him making preparations for death.'—H. G. Salter.

The kind of life many so-called members of the Church have marked out for themselves should be strictly called not walking but 'sauntering.' The very origin of this word conveys an instructive lesson. In the ages when a pilgrimage to Palestine was held in such esteem, there sprang up a set of idle impostors, who wandered about everywhere in the country, and sought alms at the hands of the inhabitants under the pretext that they were preparing to go *à la sainte terre*—to the Holy Land. It was soon discovered that they had never left their native shores; and such disgust did their vain professions inspire that a new word was coined to reprobate the shameful practice, and they were called 'saunterers.' With equal truth may the term be applied to all who profess to be Christians without moving forward energetically to the heavenly goal.—J. P. Lilley.

During a sudden freshet, a labouring man and his child, living in a cottage that stood by itself, were obliged to walk at midnight for more than a mile through water reaching to the little boy's waist before they could reach a place of safety. After they had changed their clothes, and were feeling comfortable, the friend in whose cottage they had

found shelter said to the little boy, 'And were not you afraid, Jack, while walking through the water?' 'No, not at all,' said the little fellow, who was but seven years old, 'I was walking along with father, you know, and I knew he would not let the water drown me.'—R. Newton.

Surely God did love him well
And he loved God so much he could not dwell
Where God was not. The world was blank and bare;
He was most wretched, for he could not love,
But the good Lord took pity on his woe;
For woe it is, with all the heart above,
To walk a heartless corpse on earth below,
He faded from the earth and was unseen,
A thought of God was all that he had been.—
Coleridge.

Sermons for Reference.

Bannerman (J.), Sermons, 24.
Brooks (G.), Five Hundred Outlines, 382.
Davies (J.), Kingdom without Observation, 172.
Gilfillan (G.), Alpha and Omega, i. 217.
Horton (R. F.), Lyndhurst Road Pulpit, i. 51.
James (J. A.), Sermons, ii. 335.
Laing (F. A.), Simple Bible Lessons, 17.
Lilley (J. P.), Pathway of Light, 19.
Lonsdale (J.), Sermons, 135.
Matheson (G.), Moments on the Mount, 16.
Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, i. 416.
Price (A. P.), Fifty Sermons, i. 81; x. 65.
Raleigh (A.), Way to the City, 408.
Rankin (J.), Character Studies in O.T. 14.
Stewart (J.), Outlines of Discourses.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xxii. No. 1307.
Thomas (J.), Myrtle Street Pulpit, iv. 35.

Recent Foreign Theology.

'Hippolytus.'[1]

This is the first volume of a great literary and scholarly undertaking, one of the greatest, without question, of our time. The Royal Prussian Academy of Science determined in 1891 to be responsible for the collecting, editing, and publishing of all the Greek Christian Literature (except the New Testament) from the beginning down to the time of Constantine, and appointed a committee, consisting of Diels, Dillmann, von Gebhardt, Harnack, Loofs, and Mommsen, to see their determination carried out. This committee chose the great firm of J. C. Hinrichs in Leipzig to be their publishers.

Except the books of the New Testament then, every known scrap of the Greek Christian Literature throughout the first three centuries of our era will be published. Where the Greek original has been lost, other available versions will be used instead. There will be Introductions and full critical apparatus and Indexes. There will also be occasional Appendixes. But in order that the various volumes may not swell unreasonably, essays on special points will not usually be included, but will appear in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*. The whole series is expected to be completed in fifty large volumes, and in twenty years.

Two volumes will be devoted to *Hippolytus*, and of these vol. i. has come out first of the series. It is divided into two halves, which are paged separately. The first half is edited by Professor Bonwetsch, and contains the commentaries on Daniel and on the Song of Songs. The second half is edited by Herr Achelis, and contains the minor exegetical and homiletical writings. In his Introduction Professor Bonwetsch says that the commentary on Daniel is for the first time published complete. And this is a great thing to be able to say. For not only does Dr. Salmon, in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, tell us of its 'extant fragments,' and of Bardenhewer's efforts in 1877 to restore the original 'as far as it is possible to do so'; but Moeller in 1892 speaks of 'the fragments preserved on the Book of Daniel'; and even Krüger as late as the end of 1897, and *after the issue of Bonwetsch's volume*, says that 'only the fourth book has been published as yet.'

Certainly Dr. Bonwetsch has not found a complete Greek text, but where the Greek fails, he inserts a German translation of the Slavonic. It was the discovery of this Slavonic manuscript that made it possible to give the commentary on Daniel in full. So here we have its four books—and that

[1] Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. *Hippolytus*. I. Band. Von G. Nath. Bonwetsch und Hans Achelis. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1897.

alone is achievement enough to give this series a noteworthy start.

The other things are shorter and more fragmentary; but some of the exegetical pieces are of considerable interest. None of them rivals the *Daniel* in its special line; none gives us so full and clear an example of the typological method of interpretation. But they have interest and value in other ways, and Herr Achelis deserves our warmest thanks for the painstaking care with which he has collected the various versions, or fragments of versions, and for the sound German translation of them which he has offered.

The Introductions are good. There is no wearisome exhibition of details; there is enough to show us what the sources are, and what their history has been. There are no Indexes yet; they will come with the second volume. There are two brief Appendixes. For other matters the reader may now be referred to the *Texte u. Untersuch.* (new series, vol. i. parts 3 and 4), published in 1897.

It is enough to add that the printing has been done with commendable accuracy and finish.

The New 'Gesenius.'[1]

THE greatest Hebrew Grammar and the handiest Hebrew Lexicon still go by the name of 'Gesenius.' A few weeks ago an English translation of the Grammar was published in the handsomest form (and at the handsomest price) by the Oxford Press. Here we have the Lexicon, or *Handwörterbuch*. The former has reached its twenty-sixth edition, this is the thirteenth of the latter. It is an almost unique distinction in scholarship. Many men have set the fashion or laid the foundation of some study. This man has set a fashion in the study of Hebrew that seems like to last for ever. He has built upon his foundation a completed structure that needs only an occasional repair or addition.

It is only three years since the twelfth edition of the *Handwörterbuch* was published. But much has been done in that time, and Professor Buhl has found it necessary to add considerably to its bulk. It is now a volume of 1030 pages, and will burst its paper binding if you even look at it sternly. The increase in bulk is due partly to an increase in the number of forms and passages quoted, but chiefly to an increase in the references to philological literature. It is interesting to observe that the recently discovered portion of the Hebrew Sirach has been thoroughly made use of. Then there is constant reference to König's *Syntax*, though only in the later words, for that valuable work appeared too late to be made use of from the beginning. There is in fact a marked difference between the earlier and the later words in the matter of literary reference, which Professor Buhl accounts for by saying that the volume has taken a year to print.

The words are arranged in strictly alphabetical order. The fact is that Professor Buhl does not believe it is possible to arrange them in any other way. He says that the roots are too uncertain to form the basis of an arrangement. With this the editors of the Oxford *Lexicon* disagree, and as usual something can be said on both sides. Professor Buhl's plan is at least the easier.

The original character of a *handbook* is still maintained, notwithstanding the increase in size, and the very utmost care has been taken to secure utility with brevity. The etymologies have received particular attention. And besides Professor Buhl's own labour and scholarship, the special knowledge of Professors Socin and Zimmern, each in his own department, has been spent upon it throughout. It is now as useful a lexicon as the student can find.

[1] *Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament.* In verbindung mit Professor Albert Socin und Professor H. Zimmern. Bearbeitet von Dr. Frants Buhl. Leipzig: Vogel. 1899. M. 18.

Kautzsch's 'Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen.'[2]

SINCE our notice of the first number of this important work (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, December 1898, p. 120 f.), we have received successive issues up to the sixth *Lieferung*. These contain the conclusion of Kautzsch's own very able handling of 1 Mac, Kamphausen's 2 Mac, the (so-called) Third Book of Maccabees by Kautzsch, the Books of Tobit and Judith by Löhr,

[2] *Die Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A.T.* To be completed in from twenty-four to thirty *Lieferungen*. Price of the whole (to subscribers only) not to exceed 15s. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr.

the Prayer of Manasses by V. Ryssel, and a first instalment of the Additions to Daniel by Rothstein.

Upon the whole, the above writers appear to have devoted great care to their work, both introduction and notes leaving little to be desired. The two most notable exceptions are the Books of Tobit and Judith, the introductions to which are meagre in the extreme, and not beyond the suspicion of inaccuracy in some particulars. And yet the scholar by whom both these books are handled is Professor Löhr, whose name we all hold in the highest respect. Never have we met with a more glaring instance of *dormitat Homerus* than in Löhr's passing over without any notice the numerous recent discussions about the Ahikar legend, which is apparently alluded to in the Book of Tobit. This omission is referred to by Dr. Nestle elsewhere. We may note, in passing, that an extremely interesting as well as exhaustive account of this legend, which can be traced among a great many nations, is to be found in the *Revue Biblique* of January last, pp. 50 ff. It goes without saying that Löhr's treatment of the text of these books, as well as his translation of them, reveal the qualities we should expect—all of which makes the omission in question the more extraordinary. In spite of this blemish, the expectations we ventured to express in our first notice have been realized by the work as far as it has gone, and we augur for it a warm welcome as supplying a felt want.

Bertholet on Isaiah liii.[1]

The Deutero-Isaiah literature grows apace. The question whether the Servant of the Lord passages should be detached from the rest of the book is answered by many in the affirmative, although even when this has been done there is not unanimity as to whether all the four sections ought to be assigned to one and the same hand. Another question that is keenly debated is whether the Servant in 42^{1-4} 49^{1-6} 50^{4-9}, and especially in 52^{13}–53^{12}, is to be understood in a collective or an individual sense.

Anything from the pen of Dr. Bertholet is sure of a welcome from scholars. Not only do we owe him some positive results about which there can be no question, but even in dissenting from him we learn much. In the present tractate he rejects very decidedly the collective interpretation of the Servant as = the people, holding that it is impossible to fit this concept either to the empirical (Wellhausen, Giesebrecht, Marti) or to the ideal (Dillmann, Skinner) Israel. Of the interpretations which make of the Servant an individual he rejects for various reasons attempts like those of Sellin, who finds the Suffering Servant of chap. 53 in Zerubbabel, as well as the interpretation which makes the Messiah the subject of these prophecies. His own explanation is, so far as we know, original. He finds a parallel to Is 53 in Sir 39^{1-11}, the subject of which is throughout an individual, 'the scribe,' yet no one scribe but *the* scribe as representative and type of the whole class. So Bertholet will have it that the Servant of Jahweh is 'der Torah-Lehrer' in his representative capacity, and if the specially concrete expressions in chap. 53 (which, with the exception of $v.^{11b}$, he considers to be a later insertion in an original Ebed-Jahweh poem consisting of 52^{13-15} 53^{11b}) must have a historical subject discovered for them, he suggests (admitting frankly that this is pure hypothesis) that this may be found in Eleazar, the martyr of 2 Maccabees.

Such is the barest outline of the contents of Dr. Bertholet's tractate, which, we may note in passing, will be taken account of, along with other literature, in Professor König's forthcoming English work on Deutero-Isaiah. Meanwhile we commend the tractate to all who are interested in exilic and post-exilic Israelitish history, as one from which, whatever may be their verdict on the main conclusions, they will gather what are the special difficulties of each of the leading interpretations of the Servant passages, and will be helped to form their conclusions as to the direction in which a solution is most probably to be sought.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

[1] *Zu Jesaja* 53. Ein Erklärungsversuch. Von Lic. A. Bertholet. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr. Price 75 Pf.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Oxford.

The Letters and Inscriptions of Khammurabi, King of Babylon. By L. W. King. Vol. i. London: Luzac & Co. 1898.

Mr. King has produced an interesting and valuable work, though, until the second volume is published with the translations of the cuneiform texts contained in it, it will be, except for Assyriologists, a sealed book. In the introduction, however, the author has drawn attention to what the biblical student will doubtless consider the most important result of his researches. And the mere fact that copies are given in it of the autograph letters of a contemporary of Abraham lends to it an unique interest.

Among the recent acquisitions of the British Museum which have come from Babylonia are a number of letters written by Khammurabi,—or Ammurapi, as Mr. Pinches has shown the name was also pronounced,—whose date was about 2300 B.C., if we are to believe the native chronologists. Mr. King reduces the date by a century, upon what grounds he does not tell us, but even so it is difficult to reconcile the Babylonian chronology with that of the Old Testament. Khammurabi is the Amraphel of Genesis, the deliverer of his country from the yoke of Elamite supremacy, and the most illustrious representative of the so-called first dynasty of Babylon. Under him Babylon was made the capital of a united Babylonia, a position which it never subsequently lost. As I showed years ago in my Hibbert Lectures, his reign was marked by a great literary revival, and may therefore be considered to represent an era in Babylonian history.

Dr. Scheil was the first to discover the existence of letters of Khammurabi. He found three in the Museum of Constantinople, which he has since published and translated. Another in the Louvre has been published and translated by M. Thureau Dangin (whose name Mr. King uniformly misspells Danǰin); and now Mr. King himself has found forty-four others in the British Museum. To these must be added a few more unpublished ones belonging to Lord Amherst of Hackney, to which I have referred in my *Early History of the Hebrews.*

Mr. King's copies are executed with great care and accuracy, and he has avoided the fashionable mistake of printing them on so small a scale as to be almost illegible. He has also made his collection complete by adding to it the Louvre and one of the Constantinople texts, as well as the other known inscriptions of Khammurabi, together with copies of letters from three of the successors of that prince. It is hardly necessary to say that all the letters are upon clay, the usual writing material of the Babylonians. The Babylonian postal service had been established at an early date; it was already in full working in the age of Sargon and Naram-Sin (3800 B.C.), and the clay seals with the names of those monarchs, which took the place of stamps, are now in the Louvre.

Mr. King's introduction is mainly occupied with Dr. Scheil's alleged discovery of the name of Chedor-laomer in one of the letters of Khammurabi. He has made it unnecessarily polemical by dragging in Mr. Pinches' discovery of the names of Chedor-laomer and Tidal, which has nothing to do with Dr. Scheil's readings, and is in no way affected by them. His attempt to deprive his colleague at the Museum of the honour of this discovery proves only that he has still much to learn in Assyriology, and the statement with which he concludes—that 'no such discovery' as that of the name of Chedor-laomer 'has been made,' is contrary to fact.

That Dr. Scheil's Chedor-laomer, however, is the product of erroneous copying, Mr. King has clearly shown. The name read, *Ku-dur-la-akh-ga-mar*, ought to be (*sa*)-*su I-nu-ukh-śa-mar*, which is distinctly written on one of the British Museum tablets. The photograph of the Constantinople tablet, published by Mr. King, gives *su* insead of *ku*, though the next character might be *dur* (or rather *tur*) as well as *i*, and the two last characters are not visible in it. Inukh-śamar was one of Khammurabi's officials.

Along with the name of Kudur-lakhgamar the theory falls to the ground that the Sin-idinam, to whom Khammurabi writes his letters, was the

king of Larsa of that name, who had been driven from his throne by the Elamites. Nowhere is there any trace of such having been the case; on the contrary, Sin-idinam is once called *gal Martu* (not *Martu-ki*, as Mr. King's translation seems to suppose), 'the chief of the Amorites.' He appears to have been the governor of one of the Canaanite settlements in Babylonia. 'Martu,' by the way, is not a synonym of the Elamite district of Emudbal, as Mr. King suggests after a discarded conjecture of Tiele and Winckler, and the 'country of Martu,' or rather 'Amurrû,' denoted Syria. This fact gives interest to the inscription just published by Dr. Winckler, and numbered 66 by Mr. King, in which Khammurabi is called simply 'king of Amur[rû].' The inscription is dedicated to the Canaanitish goddess [As]ratu or Asherah, and is difficult to translate, owing, apparently, to a non-Babylonian use of the Sumerian ideographs.[1] It is accompanied by a very remarkable figure in relief, a photograph of which will be found in Tomkins' *Abraham and his Age*, plate ii. The dedicator of the monument Ibirum-Amur[rû], 'the governor of the river . . . ,' must have been of Canaanitish parentage, but even so his giving Khammurabi no other title than that of 'king of the Amorite land' is noteworthy.

[1] In the third line a word Aduma (or Arama) occurs, which may be intended for Edom (or Aram?).

From a historical point of view, the letters of Khammurabi are disappointing. Perhaps the most important reference contained in them is the notice of '240 soldiers,' 'who had deserted (*iptu[ru]*) from Assyria (not "to" as Mr. King renders it), the country of Situllum.' But their value does not lie in the new historical facts which they may bring to light. It consists rather in the light which they throw on the culture and civilization of Babylonia and Western Asia in the Abrahamic age, and on the daily life of its kings and peoples. What would not the classical scholar give for the autograph letters of Plato or Aristotle? and yet here we have preserved to us, uncontaminated by the hands of later scribes, the actual correspondence of a king against whom Abraham waged battle, and who is mentioned in the Book of Genesis.

Sermonettes on the Golden Texts.

By the Rev. J. S. Maver, M.A., Aberdeen.

I.

'If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.'—John viii. 36.

There is no question that the freedom of Christ, above all freedom, is worthy of the name. And yet, perhaps there is more said in the Bible about bonds and limitations in connexion with Christ, than about freedom. A yoke is spoken of, and a burden, and a bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. What are we to make of the seeming contradiction?

There used to be a story in the school-books about a ship-captain, who, when at home, would tell his children about the strange places he had visited, and the manners and customs of the various peoples he had been among. One night, however, he played a trick upon them, and began to tell, unknowingly to them, of their own country, —how he had lived among a people who were fond of using a certain kind of grease along with their food, and who wore clothing taken from an animal's back, and made fire of something dug out of the ground; till, by and by, a bright little one saw through the trick, and exclaimed, 'Why, father, that is not a foreign country, it is our own land you are telling us about.'

And so, though the Bible speaks of obedience and bonds and limitations, it is possible for us to make a great discovery, and, by entering into that obedience, and under the yoke spoken of, to see things in a gloriously new light, such as might well make us exclaim, 'In the name of all that's good, this is not captivity, this is freedom in the grandest acceptation of the word.'

Suppose we take an example. Take the case of the Apostle Peter. In early days, in the happy irresponsible period of childhood, he went whither he would, he went out and in, he 'ran aboot the braes, and pu'd the gowans fine,' or whatever

corresponded to that in his country. As he grew up, however, he came to be girded, so far as the body was concerned. He had to mind his nets and toil on the deep. Yet the girded life meant freedom, for the most wearisome thing in life is to have nothing particular to do. 'Have one part of the day in which you are a slave, and another part in which you are a king,' is a good advice. You can't have the kinghood all the day long; at least, you can't enjoy it till you have passed through the slave period.

Still, amid all this toil, his heart was yet free, in the wilderness sense of the word. But, one day, he was told of a great preacher on the banks of the Jordan. He went to hear him, and went again and again. His heart was awakened by the Baptist, and he began to be drawn and bound. Through his brother Andrew he was, later, brought into contact with a greater Preacher still. Now, new feelings and aspirations possessed him, and his heart was captivated as never before. After the Ascension of Jesus, when the Spirit came upon him, he began to preach in the face of much opposition. He could not help himself. Nothing would have stopped him. Later still, when he would have confined the blessings of salvation to the Jews, he was led beyond that, too. He had to leave his narrow views behind. But the strange thing is that, throughout all this, St. Peter would have said that he was a free man, that he never knew what freedom was till his heart was thus bound. Even when shut up in prison he could have said—

> Though in bonds,
> I am not bound; for 'tis because I'm free,
> Because my soul could not be captive brought
> Unto a lie, that these environ me.

We have all got our chains—chains that cramp and degrade, or chains that mean freedom and honour. What a binding thing love is! Jacob's life was bound up in the lad's life, but it would have been no freedom to him to be delivered from all anxiety about Benjamin. Conscience is a terribly binding thing, but, by yielding obedience to it, we too, with the Psalmist, may be able to say, 'Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage.' And when Jesus comes with the loveliest bond of all, and says, 'For My sake,' it will be found to be, not a hampering fetter, but an ornament of grace, and Christ's captivity will be rejoiced in as freedom indeed.

II.

'He answered and said, Whether He be a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.'—JOHN ix. 25.

WHAT a full and lively chapter this is! All about a blind man who received his sight. He comes first before us sitting by the wayside, and suggests to the disciples a theme for discussion with Jesus as to the origin of his blindness. Christ rebukes them, saying, as it were, What benefit will the discussion be to the man? Is there anything, rather, that can be done for him? Jesus was always practical. More important than discussing the origin of evil, is the consideration what can be done to diminish the evil that is in the world. 'Master,' said a herd-boy to the farmer, 'the cows are in the cornfield, and I can't make out how they got in. The gate is shut, and there's no gap in the hedge.' 'Never mind how they got in,' was the reply; 'you get them out as fast as you can, and then you may consider at your leisure as to how they got in.' The blind man's sight was restored by Jesus, and that was far more to him than the most learned debate as to how his blindness came about. Then this miracle brings him into conflict with the Pharisees. When they can make nothing of him, they excommunicate him. Jesus heard of his being driven out of the Church, and, instead of separating him from Christ, that brings him and Jesus together a second time, and ultimately he receives a deeper blessing, the blessing of spiritual sight as well.

Here we have to do with the grand answer he gave the Pharisees. He stood on a fact in his own experience, and nothing could shake him. A difficult character to tackle. He was not an agnostic. He did not know much, but there was one thing as to which he was clear enough. A poor, unlettered man, probably, not fit on most points to cope with the Pharisees. 'I cannot argue with you,' he might say; 'if I entered into an argument with you, the likelihood is you could easily put me in a corner. But there is just one thing I would ask you to explain. Explain me. I was blind and now I see.' He was on very substantial ground when he stood on that, and nothing of unsettling tendency could touch him.

And herein lies the secret of real Christianity. Is there anything Christ has done for us that we are sure of? Has He given us strength against a

temptation? Has He helped us to bear a trial? Has He opened our eyes to a new view of life? That will make Him more real to us than the most logical of creeds. Not that the creed is needless. Not that theology has not its place. We have no sympathy with the man who said that he hated theology and botany, but he loved religion and flowers. He who loves flowers will be thankful for all the botany he can acquire; and, as botany helps the study of flowers, so will theology help religion. Still, there are times when botany would be entirely out of place. You remember the man whom Wordsworth scarifies, who would 'peep and botanize upon his mother's grave.' Bring your flowers there, if you will, but not your botany. And so there are times in life, the hours of suffering, of fighting, of facing death, the most solemn and critical times of life, when we do not want to be troubled with theological points; we want religion at its simplest, we want Christ a present Help in time of need. A well-known theological professor was very fond of the following lines, and was overheard repeating them on the day of his death—

> When I am to die, receive me, I'll cry,
> For Jesus hath loved me, I cannot tell why;
> But this I do find, we two are so joined,
> That He won't be in glory and leave me behind.

Observe further, that just because there was one thing this man, whose sight was restored, knew, there were many things he was ready to believe. When Jesus found him the second time, He said, 'Dost thou believe on the Son of God?' 'Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him?' was the reply. He was ready to accept anything now on the word of Jesus. And so with us; we shall be ready to believe much when there is one thing we know.

III.

'I am the Good Shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.'—JOHN x. 11.

WE are all familiar enough with the ideas connected with shepherd-life as it is pictured amongst ourselves. The poetry of our country dwells much upon it, especially up to about the beginning of this century. It was described as the ideal of a simple natural life. It was associated with the piping times of peace. The shepherds were regarded as happy swains, living a free, healthy life in communion with nature. There was little or nothing said, however, as to their relationship to the sheep. No tender and kindly thoughts centred round that. The sheep were driven this way and that, and by the help of dogs, wonderfully intelligent in executing their master's commands, but, like him, entirely regardless of the feelings of the flock.

In Eastern ideas, however, there was a close and intimate connexion between the shepherd and his sheep. A leading idea, in connexion with shepherd life there, was the shepherd's care for, and interest in, his flock, and their trustful following of him. And so, in the twenty-third Psalm, we have that idea set forth, as it were, from a sheep's point of view; the Psalmist speaking of God as his Shepherd, and of what God does for him in the way of leading and feeding and heeding him. And in the New Testament we have Jesus applying to Himself the name, and speaking from the shepherd's point of view in His relationship to those who hear His voice and follow Him.

Of all the illustrations Jesus uses to set forth what He is to men, this is the one on which He dwells at considerable length. But if Jesus said, on one occasion, regarding His people, 'How much better than a sheep,' still more might His people say regarding Himself, 'How much better than a shepherd.' No earthly relationship can but very partially represent His loving sacrifice for them, His guiding care of them, and His rich provision for them.

Jesus calls Himself the Good Shepherd as distinguished from the hireling. And a chief distinction between the two is that the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. It was very few shepherds, no doubt, that actually did that, but they were ready to do it, if need were,—ready to face the wolf in defence of their flock, or the storm in search for them. In this respect, Jesus seeks to prove His love, in that He actually gave His life on their behalf.

And, surely, to do that implies, now that He has risen again and entered the world whence He came, that His interest in their welfare will be, if that were possible, greater than ever. For it is a law of our nature that, if we make a sacrifice for any person, or any object, our interest in that person or object is thereby increased. We might think that it would rather

be just the other way, and that those for whom something was done would be the ones who would remember, with never-failing gratitude, their benefactor. But there is a wonderful lack of gratitude in the world in that respect. Do you want to have an increased affection for a brother? The best way is, not to get that brother to do something for you, but for you to do something for him. Do you want to take a deeper interest in some good cause? It will be better done, not by any benefit which the cause does for you, but by some sacrifice made by you on behalf of the cause.

I have seen a boy rescue a dog that was being persecuted by other boys in the street, and take it home. There was no beauty about the animal, it was a miserable cur, but, though his parents wished to get it out of the house, the boy desired to adopt it as a pet, and, after much pleading, his desire was granted. Why was he so interested in it? Just because he had done something for it. He had rescued it, and thereby it laid hold of his heart as it would not otherwise have done.

And so, with reverence it might be said that if anything were needed to confirm and make lasting the love of Christ for humanity, it is the greatness of the sacrifice He has made on their behalf. Christians, at the best, may be far short of what they should be in gratitude to their Saviour, but that Saviour, we may be sure, could never possibly fail in tender regard for those on whose behalf He has travailed in soul, and endured even unto death.

IV.

'My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me.'—JOHN x. 27.

HERE we have a continuation of the same subject, the relationship between Jesus and His people, and the connexion between shepherd and sheep is still the illustration used.

'My sheep hear My voice.' It is universally the case in an Eastern flock that they recognize the shepherd's voice. That is sufficient to draw them from the fold in the morning, and to bring them towards him on the plains or the hillside during the day. Foolish though they may be, they make no mistake in that. They will not be deceived by any imitation of the voice. Let a stranger attempt to call them in the same way, and he will only lead the sheep to lift their heads in alarm, and move a little nearer to their real leader. How do they know? It would be hard to say. It is not the result of cleverness on their part, it is a sort of instinct. They are simple creatures, but you can't mislead them in that respect.

So, to recognize the voice of Jesus is not a gift acquired by sharpness or cleverness, it is not something that can be taught in any school. The simplest people in the way of ordinary education may yet have an unfaltering confidence, so far as this is concerned. But is it a real voice? you may say. Well, that all depends on what you call a real voice. Jesus, for example, at the very time He said these words, was heard by those around, but that was not hearing His voice in the sense He meant. You know that people, who have no ear for music, cannot be stirred by it as a musician can. But it would seem that great musicians, even in the mere reading of a musical score, can hear and enjoy the melody and harmony that it implies. Their exquisite sense of musical appreciation enables them to hear, as it were, through the eye. And so, to the heart that is tuneful, even the reading of Scripture may be what a musical score is to a capable musician. And in days of darkness, and moments of temptation, and times when the right way seems doubtful, as the poet speaks of 'that inward eye, which is the bliss of solitude,' so the heart attuned can turn the attention of the inward ear towards Him Whom it has learned to know and trust, and hearken for the guiding Voice, saying: 'Be not afraid'; 'Be of good cheer'; 'This is the way, walk ye in it.'

'I know them,' Jesus goes on to say. If the sheep know the voice of the shepherd, the shepherd knows them in a still more intimate and complete way. Nothing would appear so difficult to a stranger as to be able to distinguish each member of a flock of sheep. They look all so much alike. But the shepherd makes no mistakes. A missionary tells of a Lebanon shepherd who said to him that, even if blindfolded, he could tell in a moment if a sheep was his or not, simply by putting his hands on its face.

To us Christ's perfect and complete knowledge of every member in His great fold is incompre-

hensible. Such knowledge is too high for us. We know how difficult it is to get acquainted with a few. The teacher in a school needs time to know all his pupils. The pastor of a congregation has difficulty in avoiding mistakes, especially at first when all are strange to him. And some in a congregation are very unreasonable in their expectations.

> 'Ho, sailor of the sea!
> How's my boy—my boy?'
> 'What's your boy's name, good wife,
> And in what good ship sailed he?'
> 'You come back from the sea
> And not know my John?
> I might as well have asked some landsman
> Yonder down in the town.'

That good mother did not realize the wideness of the sea, and how that there was many and many a ship and ship's crew upon its bosom.

But God's thoughts are not as our thoughts. It is far beyond our little minds to comprehend the Saviour's knowledge. Some day in the hereafter we may understand better, but here it is simply for us to take Him at His own word, and to believe that all are known and dear to Him, and that the way of none is hid from the Lord.

Lastly, Jesus says, 'They follow Me.' And that implies not only that they follow trustfully, but that He leads considerately. As a shepherd would lead his flock with some pasture land ultimately in view, even though for a time, it might have to be, through barren places, so will Christ lead those who follow Him, always to something worth reaching at last. Many a step may have to be taken on trust, and the way may be long and difficult, but the end will repay. No one ever yet regretted following Christ as Guide.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

BIBLE READINGS FROM THE PENTATEUCH. By T. W. Peile, M.R.A.C. (*Bemrose.* 8vo. 6s. net.)

This volume is part of a large undertaking. How large, Mr. Peile gives us some idea by paging straight on. This is the third volume of the series, and it includes pages 715 to 1398. But it is not so great as it is large. For to be great one has to be oneself, and Mr. Peile does not care for that. He quotes so freely from Edersheim, that we wonder if Edersheim had not written whether Mr. Peile would have been an author. And yet Edersheim is only one of those whom he so liberally admires and immortalizes. He does not care to see his own writing. He quotes and uses marks of quotation, and calls himself editor not author.

And yet he shows his own hand in the kind of quotation he makes, and especially in the historical or higher criticism he offers us, which is his own entirely. His attitude is that of the extreme right, placing Canon Cheyne, for example, on the extreme left. For whereas Cheyne does not now believe that any of the Psalms were composed before the Captivity, Mr. Peile believes that many of them were sung during the wilderness wanderings, and that one of them, Psalm cxxx., was discovered 'amongst the private documents of Moses after his death.' This is found in one of the Appendixes, which are, perhaps, the most interesting things in the book. In another we have a remarkable chapter of etymologies, in which the affinity of the word *God* is traced through the Hindostanee *Khoda* to the Hebrew *Q'dosh*, holy, unspotted. Canon Cheyne would not agree with that either.

ERAS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE. By Lucius Waterman, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* Crown 8vo, pp. xviii, 505. 6s.)

The place which the 'Eras' have taken is a high one. Some previous volumes have been masterpieces, all have attained success. But it is doubtful if the present volume will lift them any higher. Its learning is competent enough, but it has two faults. One is that its style is too familiar, the other is that its manner is too

apologetic. Dr. Waterman does not impress us as a judge, but as an advocate. And sometimes he just escapes the advocate's awful sin of abusing the plaintiff's attorney when he has no case.

On the whole, however, the fault of manner is less pronounced with further reading. When questions of Church organization are left behind, the tone becomes more truly historical. The fault of style remains to the end. But we will not deny that it has advantages. There is never any doubt about Dr. Waterman's meaning, there is never any question of his emphasis. Occasionally, too, the style is striking and fits the modern thought, as in the passage on page 453, where the distinction is explained between heresy and bad theology.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, WITH A CRITICAL INTRODUCTION. By the Rev. George Milligan, B.D. *T. & T. Clark.* Post 8vo, pp. 253. 6s.)

Any book with the name of Milligan upon it is sure of a ready welcome. No Scotch theologian of recent years was found so acceptable to the English mind. The High Churchman who cannot bring himself to a recognition of Presbyterian orders, quotes Milligan on the *Heavenly Priesthood*, and (as in the case of Dr. Moberly) almost builds his system of theology upon him. William Milligan was the father; George Milligan is the son. And they differ as they ought to do. But this volume will prove to everyone that the son is capable of equally painstaking and equally memorable work as the father. That could not have been said before. The little book on the English versions was a fine piece of scholarship deservedly commended by the Bishop of Durham. But it gave less scope, and was less testing. This is as severe a test of ability as one could find.

Mr. Milligan has divided his book into two parts. About one-third is occupied with the Introduction, the rest with the Theology. Both are written to be read, in a natural telling style and clear arrangement. The arrangement is a strong feature. It is part of the whole finish and attraction of the book, which cannot but charm the reader.

Into the contents we do not intend at present to go. We do not care to tell even where Mr. Milligan is upon the authorship. It is enough that we can unreservedly recommend the volume as a sensible as well as a fertilizing study of the outward features, but especially the inner thought, of this great Epistle.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have also published a new edition of Dr. Forrest's book, *The Christ of History and of Experience.* It is a book of marked and now well-recognized ability. The problems of our day, not of any other, are its theme, and it handles them with modern scientific skill. In some respects it shows the way in which religious thought is going, in some respects leads and guides it. Its subject—and its subject is never forgotten—is the subject that has most frequently absorbed the interest of the Christian world, and never more keenly or hopefully than at the present time. We feel safe in saying that it is one of the few books of last season that will remain with us.

The Rev. Arthur T. Pierson has written two small books of practical piety, and published them through Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls. The one is a sketch of Catherine of Siena's life, the other a study in biblical theology under the title of *In Christ Jesus.*

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF SACRED THEOLOGY. By Abraham Kuyper, D.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* 8vo, pp. xxv, 683. 12s.)

Dr. Kuyper is the great pillar of orthodox theology in Holland to-day, and his *Encyclopædie der Heilige Godgeleerdheid* is his greatest work. It is a large work, and is not all translated here, only the second of its three volumes with some fifty pages of the first. Whether the remainder will be rendered into English probably depends on the reception this part receives. It ought to receive a warm reception. For it is most refreshingly easy in style, untechnical to a degree that would have shocked our fathers, and still shocks some of 'their succeeding race,' as one can see by an occasional foolish notice of Dr. Clarke's *Outlines of Theology.* But besides the simplicity of its style, its attitude is unmistakable on every question. Perhaps the most interesting portion of this volume is the treatment of the authority of Scripture. Dr. Kuyper holds that the authority of every part of Scripture has been settled by Christ and His apostles. Christ quoted from the Old Testament, called it Scripture, and said it could not be broken, and that settles the authority of

the Old Testament. When you argue that in the Sermon on the Mount Christ seems to supersede some things in the Old Testament, Dr. Kuyper is ready to answer No. What He did was, 'by His accurate exegesis, to maintain the Old Testament over against the false exegesis of the Sanhedrin of His day.'

Now, there are difficulties in that position, but Dr. Kuyper is aware of them, and does not shirk them. It is not his nature to shirk anything. For example, there is the quotation in He 10^5—but that had best be given as a Note of Recent Exposition.

Well, take it all in all, it is the ablest exposition of what is called the plenary inspiration of Scripture that we have seen. It will become a bulwark of strength to those who are with it; from others it will demand careful and strenuous answering.

NEGLECTED FACTORS IN THE STUDY OF THE EARLY PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. James Orr, D.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* Crown 8vo, pp. 235. 3s. 6d.)

The title is long, but the book is short and to the point. Professor Orr undertakes to prove three theses, and proves them. First, that early Christianity had a larger extension *laterally*, *i.e.* in number; secondly, that it had a much larger extension *vertically*, *i.e.* as respects the richer classes; and thirdly, that it had a much greater influence *penetratively*, *i.e.* upon the thought and life of the age, than is generally believed. It simply means that we must take our Gibbon and read something into him (as well as out of him). All the great historians are being tried and found wanting somewhere. Even the great Lecky will be found unfit to turn the absolute scale some day. And why not Gibbon? Nay, Gibbon likeliest of all, for he left a great factor out, and was bound to be wrong in many of his facts. Professor Orr has corrected Gibbon and others. He has given us a study in historical method. It is a valuable addition to scientific thought as well as to Early Christian History. He has also given a lesson in modesty, and some great historians need that.

CATHOLICISM, ROMAN AND ANGLICAN. By A. M. Fairbairn, D.D. LL.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* Crown 8vo, pp. xxiii, 481. 7s. 6d.)

As Dr. Fairbairn tells us, and as we did not need to be told, these chapters first appeared as articles in the *Contemporary Review*. This explains the freedom with which each chapter begins and ends with itself, and the enjoyment with which one can take up the book again, after having been compelled to lay it down awhile. Yet there is a unity. There is the unity of one great earnest protest—the dominating interest in a strong personality—the protest against the exclusiveness of the 'Oxford' theology.

That theology will ignore Dr. Fairbairn's book—till the day of judgment—and be exclusive still. But Dr. Fairbairn's book will hasten the day of judgment.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have also published a valuable exposition of *The Apostles' Creed*, admirably translated by C. S. Burn and A. E. Burn, B.D. The second half of the book has appeared in the *Expositor*, but that need not hinder its circulation, which it is earnestly to be hoped will be wide.

Messrs. Maclehose have published three lectures, by Professor Hastie of Glasgow, under the title, *Theology as Science*. Properly, that is the title of the first lecture only, but it may stand for the whole. For they are all theological, and all scientific. Living and modern and most stimulating indeed, they make it very clear that Dr. Hastie is a thinking force in theology.

THE CHRISTIAN CREED AND THE CREEDS OF CHRISTENDOM. By Samuel G. Green, B.A., D.D. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. xx, 347. 6s.)

This is the second series of the Angus Lectures. The first series was delivered by Dr. Angus, recently the President of Regent's Park College, in whose honour the lectureship is founded. The subject was *Regeneration*. In choosing Creeds and Tests, Dr. Green gives us to understand that the Foundation is a comprehensive one. But he is as impressive and practical as Dr. Angus on Regeneration. It is not a mere historical inquiry that he has entered upon. Whether a Church should have a formulated Creed, and how strictly the Creed, if it has one, should bind its members, are matters of pressing interest to him. It is also a matter of interest, deepest of all, to know how men have hit or missed the truth as they have formed their Creeds. And thus he keeps his subject alive from cover to cover, and gives us knowledge on the way.

Perhaps the most instructive part of the book

begins on page 242, or even on page 235, with the opening of the seventh lecture. There Dr. Green states the grounds of Christian certainty. After telling us that there are subjects of absolute certainty, others of varying degrees of decision, and others of speculation, he says that the three facts which must be held without question by every Christian, are the Fatherhood of God, the Redemption by Jesus Christ, and the communication of light and life by the Eternal Spirit.

On the question of Tests, Dr. Green has his mind made up. And we can guess in what direction, when we know Dr. Green and the Angus Foundation. But he does not forget himself, and make no test the test of Church membership or of Christian fellowship.

Messrs. Macmillan, it must be added, have issued the volume in their most attractive style. Is it too much to hope that they will issue the whole series, and uniformly?

Messrs. Passmore & Alabaster have published the forty-fourth volume of *The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit* (8vo, pp. 624, 7s.). The sermons which this volume contains were mostly preached in 1883, but we see more than one as old as 1856. And there is little difference between them. Spurgeon got hold of the gospel early, and himself as a preacher almost as early. If there is a note of difference, it seems to be in a different estimate of men. The later Spurgeon, it seems, had more faith in men than the earlier. Lost, ruined—yes, that always; but something to appeal to even in lost men he found later, something that could be touched tenderly. The earthquake and the fire in the earlier, the still small voice in the later sermons, there does seem to be that difference.

Messrs. Passmore & Alabaster have also published another shilling volume of selected sermons, *Twelve Sermons on Ritualism.*

Messrs. Rivington have begun the issue of a new series of very small books at one shilling, to be called 'Oxford Church Text Books.' The general editor is the Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A. The first volume, just issued, is by the Rev. R. S. Ottley, M.A., and on *The Hebrew Prophets.* Mr. Ottley is a scholar, and knows scholarship. He uses the very best authorities, and uses the right parts of them. He writes clearly and orderly also. It is an excellent start.

THOUGHTS ON HELL. By Victor Morton. (*Sands.* Crown 8vo, pp. 135. 2s.)

'Our David,' said a mother, 'goes now to hear Mr. B. You see Mr. B. has no hell, and our David likes that.' But what will 'our David' do in the swelling of the Jordan, or even if he should chance to read a book like Mr. Morton's? For Mr. Morton is no fossil, in theology or in science. It is what we have to believe about hell, we, the heirs of the ages, that he tells us. And there seems no escape from his logic or appeal.

Mr. John F. Shaw has published a small volume of plain persuasive sermons by the Rev. F. Harper, M.A., under the title of *Echoes from the Old Evangel.* Perhaps the quotations are somewhat numerous, but the gospel is in them.

HELPS TO GODLY LIVING. Selected by J. H. Burn, B.D. (*Stock.* Crown 8vo, pp. 200. 3s. 6d.)

There may be writers and living writers whose works contain more 'gems' than are to be found in the writings of Archbishop Temple, but it is certain that from Archbishop Temple's writings a better selection of 'gems' could not have been made. Mr. Burn knows every sermon preached, and apparently every speech delivered, during the last forty years. He seems to have been preparing for this task for a generation. But the truth is that he has a quite unique knowledge of current homiletical literature, and he has also the literary sense to know the best. It is a beautiful book; the best possible souvenir of Archbishop Temple the Terrible.

Mr. Elliot Stock has begun a very cheap issue of Gray's *Biblical Museum.*

THE FATHER'S HAND. By the Rev. Adam Philip, M.A. (*Stockwell.* Crown 8vo, pp. 298. 3s. 6d.)

Mr. Philip has here hit upon and skilfully worked out a new and fertile subject for pulpit discourse. 'The Father's Hand' means God's ways of working. And so each sermon deals with one aspect of God's work. There is the slowness of God's work, the swiftness of God's work, the stillness, the secrecy, the simplicity, the steadiness, and the like, until, apparently,

every aspect of God's work has been treated, and a most stimulating as well as instructive volume of sermons has been produced. Let it be added that it has an unmistakable literary flavour, as indeed all true devotional work must have. For the pen of the ready writer must be sweet when it speaks of the things touching the King. Therefore let this book be unreservedly recommended. It contains a complete section of Christian doctrine, a strengthening guide to Christian work, a fruitful theme of pulpit exposition.

The Sunday School Union has issued another book by C. M. Sheldon, who bids fair to be our favourite among religious novelists of America. This time it is *His Brother's Keeper*. Its lesson is manifest, and pressed urgently home. The edition is an attractive one.

The same House has published an edition (uniform with that just noticed) of *Robert Hardy's Seven Days*, by the same author. Better apply to the Sunday School Union for a set of Mr. Sheldon's works.

JOHN WESLEY AND GEORGE WHITEFIELD IN SCOTLAND. By the Rev. D. Butler, M.A. (*Blackwood*. Crown 8vo, pp. 325. 5s.)

It would be difficult to flatter the man who, finding himself with leisure in a country parish, sets his mind and accomplishes work like this. For it is needful, helpful, abiding work. Even a local parish history is a good work if well done. But this is better. For it is not local. It is of the whole world, as Wesley said his parish was. One cannot but count it a fine thing that a minister of the Church of Scotland should attempt an appreciation of Wesley's and of Whitefield's work, or any part of it. We reckon it still finer that Mr. Butler has so thoroughly and even charmingly carried it through. He has written a small part of a large history in such a way that it will not have to be written again. And the future historian of either Wesley or Whitefield will be compelled to make much of this book, or fail.

The Rev. Andrew James Forson has published through Mr. William Kidd three Sunday morning addresses on *The Law of Love* (Dundee: *Kidd*, 1s.). They are so simple in style and appropriate in feeling that the booklet, which is attractively bound, should serve admirably as a present.

The Story of Ahikar.

1. 'Century, what a joy it is to live! Go, barbarism, and take the rope' (*i.e.* to hang thyself), wrote Ulrick Hutten, the champion of Renaissance and Reformation, at the news that some letters of Cicero had been rediscovered. To a similar feeling of joy the modern student of letters and divinity might give expression almost every half-year, not to say every month, as often as a number of The Expository Times come to his hands. What a number of new 'finds' have been mentioned in its columns. Especially, the field of Biblical Literature has been favoured. And not the least benefit of the new finds is that they cause us to re-examine the old treasures with which we believe ourselves to be familiar from long standing. Such is the case with *The Story of Ahikar*.[1]

2. Many a reader will perhaps be shocked to be told that a story which he knows perhaps, or probably does not know, but might have known from the Arabian *Thousand and One Nights*, has a close connexion with one of the apocryphal books of our Old Testament, which deserve also, by the bye, to be better known than they are, as well as with a well-known parable of our Lord and with the sad history of the traitor among His disciples, and that it ought to be added as another volume to the library of our Lord as one of the books which influenced His teachings. And yet it is so, at least according to the Introduction of the present volume; and to a great extent this Introduction will hold good. The Story of Ahikar, which we get here, must rank in future with the Book of Tobit.

3. Startling as this news will be to many, it was no secret to such scholars as were a little versed in the field of O.T. Apocrypha, since Georg Hoffmann of Kiel (the pupil of Lagarde) hinted at it in vol. vii. of the *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* in 1880. And it is one of the serious drawbacks in the new work of Professor Kautzsch on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. [which was in many respects justly recommended by J. A. Selbie to the readers of The Expository Times (December

[1] *The Story of Ahikar, from the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Greek, and Slavonic Versions*. By F. C. Conybeare, J. Rendel Harris, and Agnes Smith Lewis. London: C. J. Clay & Sons. Glasgow: 263 Argyle Street. 1898. Price 15s.

1898, p. 120)] that the scholar to whom the Book of Tobit was intrusted, betrayed not the least knowledge of this fact. Not to speak of other sources, he might have learnt it from Zöckler's commentary (pp. 163, 169), where a reference is to be found to a paper by the late Professor Aug. Müller, whose name we miss also in the Introduction to the present work, as well as that of Professor Bickell ('A Source of the Book of Tobit,' in the *Athenæum*, 22nd November 1890, 29th January 1891).

4. We do not intend to go into details: it is established beyond any reasonable doubt that we have here a story about the Ahikar (Achiacharus), who is mentioned four times in the Book of Tobit (1^{4} 2^{10} $11^{17.18}$ 14^{10}), and that this story is not derived from the Book of Tobit, but is presupposed by the latter. The publisher would do well to bring out at once a popular edition of the present book, culling out the 110 pages of Arabic, Syriac, and Armenian texts, and leaving the rest as it stands. This would come to be a favourite book not only with the student of the Old Testament, but also, and above all, with the folk-lorist. Nor must the students of Greek literature neglect this book; they will find their Ἀισωπος in it in a new connexion.

5. Much as has been done in the Introduction, which is the work of the versatile Rendel Harris, to clear up the intricate history of the romance, much remains to be investigated. Even the name of the hero is strange. It is true there is scarcely a doubt that the Syriac form אחיקר is the true one, from which the Arabic *Haikar* is an abbreviation, like the Phenician *Hiram* from Ahiram, the African *Hamilcar* from Ahimelech; but it is strange that the root יקר ('costly,' 'dear') is never met with in biblical names, and very seldom in Syriac ones. The name of his wife,—it is characteristic that she bears a name only in the Syriac version,—which is transliterated *Ashfegani* (p. xxxiv) or *Eshfagni* (p. 70), would be better spelled *Ashpagane*; it is clearly Persian, the 'horse-coloured'; compare such names as Ῥοδογούνη, Ἀλογούνη. Other names have a decided Babylonian ring, and are witnesses to the high antiquity of our story.

6. One benefit, we have said, is that the new texts make us read the old ones again, and under new aspects. This promises good results, especially for the Book of Tobit. It has come down to us in at least two Greek recensions, and the common supposition is—the Introduction to the present work and the translator of Tobit in the new work of Professor Kautzsch start from it—that the vulgar one is the original. The present writer is fully convinced that the contrary is true. The Codex Sinaiticus, and this codex alone, has preserved to us the original Greek text. In the Codex Alexandrinus and Vaticanus it is abbreviated, still more in the Latin Vulgate, which speaks of Tobias in the third person, while in the Greek texts at the beginning he tells his own history; just as some recensions of the Story of Ahikar kept the first person, while others turned it into the third. To adduce but one example: it has been hitherto believed that in Tobit we have a direct allusion to the Book of Jonah, and Reuss in his translation uses this circumstance to fix the date of the Book of Tobit. Now Hugo Grotius, almost 300 years ago, already conjectured that instead of Jonah we must read *Nahum*; and, behold, when Tischendorf found the Sinaiticus, it showed Ναουμ in the place of Ἰωνα (14^{8}). There are many tokens which prove the greater originality of this recension.

But we must stop. Startling as it seemed at first, that a story from the *Thousand and One Nights* should have connexions with our Bible, not as the offspring of a biblical book, but as an ancestor of it, it is no longer incredible, and this is reason enough for anyone who has his eyes wide enough open to join in Hutten's sentiment: 'Century, what a joy to live!'

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

Contributions and Comments.

Additional Note to 'the True Date of Abraham and Moses.'

An article on 'Israel in Egypt and the Exodus,' by the Rev. Professor J. Orr, D.D., Edinburgh, appeared in the *Expositor* of March 1897 (pp. 161–177). This article its author kindly sent me a few days ago. Unfortunately the *Expositor* is not accessible to me here in Munich; it is not to be found even in the otherwise so amply stored *Staatsbibliothek*. I had the misfortune also to overlook at the time the short account given in The Expository Times (April 1897, p. 289 f.) of the contents of the above-named very important article, and in any case, attached as I then was to the prevailing view that Merenptah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus, it would probably not have made the same impression upon me as now, when on altogether different grounds from Professor Orr I have come to adopt the date 2100 B.C. for Hammurabi and Gn 14. But in other directions the order of thought and the argument in the two articles (Professor Orr's and my own) are quite parallel. For instance—

	Orr.	Hommel.
Founding of the Temple	965 B.C.	958
Exodus	1445 (=965+480)	1438 (=958+480)
Departure of Abram from Harran	*c.* 2100 (=1445+650)	2083 (=1438+645)

Both of us have likewise laid stress upon the date in Jg 11^{26} (300 years from the end of the Wilderness Wanderings till the time of Jephthah).

Regarding what may now perhaps be considered the established date for Abraham 'about 2100' (more exactly, Hammurabi 2130–2087, figures which perhaps should be reduced by about 10 years), Professor Orr (p. 167 of his article) has only the following passage:—

> 'Archæological discovery has now enabled us to fix with an approach to certainty the date of Abraham, through his connexion with Chedorlaomer. Taking the lowest date for this ruler, we may place his invasion of Canaan about 2100 B.C. (This is accompanied by a footnote on the word Chedorlaomer: "Thus, *e.g.* Conder in *The Bible and the East*, p. 29; others, as Sayce, place it higher.")'

All the fuller was his argument for the 18th dynasty as the time of the oppression and the Exodus. With me, on the other hand, the date 2100 for Abraham was the starting-point that had to be established by a somewhat detailed process of reasoning. All the same, I have pleasure in noting the priority of Professor Orr, to whose important argument I would certainly have adverted had I been acquainted with it.

Results which have been reached independently of one another (and, in spite of partial similarity of arguments, by different roads) may now hope with all the more confidence to gain acceptance both from experts and from the general public.

Fritz Hommel.

Munich, Feb. 5, 1899.

Professor Sayce and Recent Archaeological Discoveries.

In last month's Expository Times (February, p. 201 f.), Professor Sayce gave an account of a cuneiform tablet recently discovered by Dr. Scheil, which contains a new version of the Story of the Deluge. It may not be out of place to remind readers that in The Expository Times of May 1898 (p. 377 f.), I pointed out, and proved by quoting Dr. Scheil's own translation *in extenso*, that Professor Sayce in the Preface to his *Early History of the Hebrews* (p. vii f.) gave an inaccurate account of the contents of the tablet in question. He there professed to have Dr. Scheil's authority for the statement that this tablet 'contains *the same text* of the Story of the Flood as that which was discovered by G. Smith,' and upon this alleged agreement he based *a very important argument* as to the composition of the Pentateuch. It is so far well that in his article last month he now admits that 'the new version is *totally different* from that discovered by Mr. G. Smith,' but it is surprising that he ignores the exposure of his error which was made by myself and others.

It is a matter for sincere regret that one who wields so facile a pen and has such a gift of clear exposition as Professor Sayce, should adopt and popularize such hasty conclusions as to the bearing of archæological discoveries upon the contents of the Old Testament. If he builds lofty and spacious superstructures upon narrow foundations, the re-

moval of the latter necessarily causes the collapse of a huge mass. A considerable gap is made in his *Early History of the Hebrews* by the discovery of the real contents of Dr. Scheil's Deluge tablet, and there are tokens that the process of collapse is only beginning. In a recently published volume, Mr. King of the British Museum appears to have proved (*and we are informed that Professor Sayce admits this*) that Dr. Scheil's reading of the name *Chedorlaomer* in the letters of Hammurabi is based upon faulty copying. It may turn out that Mr. King goes too far in rejecting also Mr. Pinches' discovery of this name, but his objections will at all events prevent Professor Sayce from saying in future (see p. ix of the Preface to his *History of the Hebrews*) that it is solely non-Assyriologists who question the reading. The point will have to be settled by Assyriologists, whose final conclusion, be it what it may, will be readily accepted by Old Testament critics.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Notes on 1 Kings x. 25; Neh. iii. 19.

1. In 1 K 10^{25} (= 2 Ch 9^{24}) we read that Solomon received year by year 'vessels of silver, and vessels of gold, and raiment, and armour (נֶשֶׁק), and spices, horses, and mules.' The verse is straightforward, and it is only when we come to look at the versions that critical interest is aroused. Curiously enough 𝔊 (B, A, Lucian) agree in offering for נֶשֶׁק the remarkable rendering *στακτή*, the origin of which does not at first sight appear. It is not easy to see how *στακτή* could have arisen from נשק. Of the other passages where נשק occurs, it is correctly recognized in 2 K 10^{2}, Ezk $39^{9f.}$ (*τὰ ὅπλα*), cf. Ps 140^{8} (*πολέμου*); it appears to be misunderstood in Is 22^{8}; and in Job 20^{24} 39^{21}, it is possible that the Massoretic text is corrupt. Whatever be the origin of 𝔊's *στακτή* (according to Thenius it represents נָטָף), it is at all events undesirable to correct the M.T. after 𝔊, if only on account of the collective, 'spices,' which follows.[1]

[1] According to Hatch-Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, *στακτή* renders לט (twice), אַהֲלוֹת, כֹּר, נָטָף, גַּפְרִית (once).

It is equally remarkable to find that the Peshitta (1 K) and Josephus (*Ant.* 7. 7, 3) appear to omit נשק, and agree in inserting 'litters, chariots' (ܣܘܟܠ, *ἅρματα*) between 'horses' and 'mules.' It is true the Pesh. reads also ܘܪܟܒ, but it is highly probable that this is a later correction after the M.T., similar to the correction *ὅπλα* which Lucian offers, together with *στακτή*, in 2 Ch. This rendering, 'chariots,' does not, I think, necessarily imply any other reading than (נשק(ים, since it finds support in Ezk $39^{9f.}$, where the נשק serves instead of wood, and appears to denote a wooden chariot rather than 'weapons,' which, being wholly or partly of metal, would be less inflammable.

Omitting the corrections ܘܪܟܒ and *ὅπλα* in 1 K (Pesh.) and 2 Ch (Lucian) respectively, we see that 𝔊BAL read *στακτή*, the origin of which is obscure, and Pesh. (1 K) and Jos. read 'chariots' and ignore 𝔊's *στακτή*. The problem is to find a word from which both readings '*stacte*' and 'chariots' could arise. As a possible solution it may be conjectured that the list in 1 K 10^{25}, 2 Ch 9^{24}, should be restored (after כְּלֵי זָהָב) as follows:—שְׁלָמוֹת וּבְשָׂמִים סוּסִים וּמֻרְנְשָׁקִים וּפְרָדִים. The unfamiliar מרנשקים is the Assyr. *mûr-niṣke*, 'horses' (see Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterb.*, *s.* 'mûru'). To account more clearly for Pesh. and Jos. we may suppose that by *mûr-niṣkê* chariot—or litter—horses are intended, although this is, perhaps, not absolutely necessary since the Arabic version (Walton), which in Kings follows the Peshitta, agrees more nearly with the suggested original text by reading ܒܪܕ̈ܝܢ *jumenta*. At an early date the word became unintelligible, and was divided, with the result that in some copies (נשק(ים, and in others מר alone survived. Thus Pesh. and Jos. testify to the word (נשק(ים at all events as concerns its original position after סוּסִים. In our M.T. (cf. Vulg.) מר has disappeared, and in 𝔊, on the contrary, מר alone was found, and was not unnaturally confused with מֹר 'myrrh' (cf. *στακτή* for מֹר in Ca 1^{13}, and ܣܡܛܐ 2 Ch [Pesh.]). It is true the explanation suggested implies that the position of the fragments has varied, but this is not a serious objection, for even Lucian in 1 K reads *στακτή after* (and not, as do B and A, *before*) בשמים. It is even possible that Lucian's *ὅπλα* in 2 Ch is not a correction, but that his text actually read (נשק(ים and מר before and after שלמות respectively.

If we are justified in assuming that the M.T. has preserved one-half of the original and 𝔊 the other, we find an interesting parallel in Schrader's suggested restoration, 'Nirgal-šar-uṣur,' in 2 K 19[37] (M.T., שראצר, and Abydenus *ap.* Eus. 'Nergilus'), see *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* (2nd ed. ii. 14 f.). It may be mentioned as a point in favour of the reading *mûr-niṣḳe* that other examples of what appear to be loan-words from the Assyrian have been pointed out in 1 K 10; see, *e.g.*, Professor Cheyne, 'Almug Trees' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July (pp. 470 ff.).

Finally, the agreement between the Pesh. and Jos. raises interesting questions, with which space will not allow us to deal. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus* (Basel, 1895), has already shown that both not unfrequently agree against the M.T. in Judges and Samuel, and the fact that Lucian is often included in this category suggests that in 1 K 10 at least we have not his recension in its original form.

2. In the enumeration of the passages where נשק occurs (see above), Neh 3[19] was intentionally held over for separate treatment. Here, for the M.T. מִנֶּגֶד עֲלֵית הַנֶּשֶׁק הַמִּקְצֹעַ, 𝔊BA reads: '(the second part of the) *πύργου ἀναβάσεως τῆς συναπτούσης τῆς γωνίας*.' Lucian, however, has a doublet: '*ἐξ ἐναντίας πύργου ἀναβάσεως τῶν ὅπλων τῆς συναπτούσης εἰς τὴν γωνίαν* (*ὀπίσω εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτοῦ*).' *πύργου*, of course, points to מִגְדָּל (for מִנֶּגֶד), and *συναπτούσης may* represent הַנֶּגֶשׁ (a misreading of הַנֶּשֶׁק). Should we not read עֲלִיַּת הַמִּקְצֹעַ מִנֶּגֶד הַנֶּשֶׁק? The 'ascent of the turning (of the wall)' agrees with מִן־הַמִּקְצֹעַ in v.[20], and the particular 'turning' is definitely located 'in front of the armoury.' The brackets in 𝔊L represent a marginal gloss, *εἰς τὸ ὄρος* (הַהָרָה), which has been wedged in between *ὀπίσω* and *αὐτοῦ* (=אחריו, v.[20a]). In the M.T. it is represented by the corrupt הַחֹרָה in v.[20], which 𝔊BאAL omit, and it has found its way into the text of v.[20], but has not yet suffered corruption in the Vulg. 'post eum *in monte* aedificavit.' Strangely enough the gloss seems to have wandered into a second passage, viz. v.[8] (the verses may have originally stood opposite one another in parallel columns), where the M.T. reads עזיאל בן־חרהיה צורפים, 'Uzziel, son of Harhaiah, goldsmiths' (R.V.). But the text can hardly be defended, and with the omission of the intrusive חרהיה (note the variants חרחיה, and especially הרהיה), and the slight correction הצורפים, we have 'Uzziel, one of the goldsmiths,' in exact agreement with 'Hananiah, one of the apothecaries,' in the same verse. In thus tracing the fortunes of the marginal gloss ההרה, we find a useful parallel in Wellhausen's suggested marginal בעלי קשת on פרשים (2 S 1[6]), of which בעלי may have found its way into v.[6] before פרשים and קשת into v.[18] (*Text d. Bücher Samuelis, ad loc.*; cf. Driver, *Samuel*, p. 181).

If we are correct in our conjecture that vv.[8. 19] stood opposite one another in parallel columns, it is at once possible to gain some idea of the length of a column in a pre-Massoretic stage of a Hebrew MS. From צוֹרְפִים (v.[8]) to הַמִּקְצֹעַ (v.[19]) inclusive, there are twenty to twenty-three lines in the printed editions (Ginsburg, Baer, etc.). The usage of Hebrew MSS varies greatly, but columns of twenty-one lines are to be found in the oldest undated MS., Orient. 4445 (Brit. Mus., *circ.* 820–850 A.D.), and in the St. Petersburg Codex (916 A.D.). Again, from the evidence of the Talm. *Soferim* (ii. 5), it appears that pages of forty-two, sixty, seventy-two, and ninety-eight lines were known, and in the first-mentioned number we have clearly a page of two columns, each with twenty-one lines. On the subject of the length of pages and lines in pre-Massoretic MSS, I may refer to Mayer-Lambert and A. Büchler in the *Revue des Études Juives* (1896, vol. xxxiii. pp. 305 f.; 1897, vol. xxxiv. pp. 94 ff.). Assuming with the latter that the average line contained seven or eight words, with twenty-seven to thirty-two letters, we find that the column represented by Neh 3[8-19] (containing 185 words, 734 letters) comprises about twenty-three to twenty-five lines, which number would be reduced if we take into account that, as is well known, the majority of *matres lectionis* were omitted in the earliest MSS. Again, from the accidental repetition in 2 S 6[3b-4a] (see Driver, *ad loc.*), we may assume that this book was written in lines of about six words with twenty-eight letters, while the dittographed בשבת in 2 S 23[8] (in v.[7] it stood at the beginning of a line which the scribe commenced to rewrite), suggests a line of seven words with twenty-seven letters. Applying this to Wellhausen's suggestion regarding 2 S 1[6. 18], we find that the column from הפרשים (v.[6]) to יהודה (v.[18]) inclusive, amounts to 149 words, or 550

letters, which leaves us with a column of about twenty lines.

These brief notes upon a subject, a fuller discussion of which is impossible here, may perhaps suggest the lines upon which a thorough study might be advantageously made. It is not impossible that other cases may be found where a marginal note has found its way into passages in parallel columns, and it is equally possible that there may be instances where whole pages have suffered transposition. Finally, there is the evidence to be obtained from *homoeotelenta*, although the frequency with which these particular phenomena occur renders cautious treatment absolutely necessary.

STANLEY A. COOK.

London.

Our Lord's Use of the Book of Hosea.

WHATEVER throws any light on our Lord's study of the Scriptures cannot fail to be of value to us. If we can say of any passage that it was a favourite text of His, it must be Hos 6^6: 'For I desire mercy and not sacrifice,' which we find Him quoting on two occasions (the only passage of which that can be said, save the phrase in the second verse of the same chapter to be referred to later), viz. Mt 9^{13} and 12^7.

This suggests the inquiry as to whether we can trace elsewhere the influence of this book upon Him. I think we can. To begin with, Hosea was of Galilee, and had from her familiar sights and natural features drawn many spiritual lessons (for details see G. A. Smith's commentary, pp. 232–33). Is it too much to claim that herein the 'greater Galilean' found a hint for the origin of His wonderful parables? Might not the story of the prodigal wife suggest the story of the prodigal son? Then we find the frequent references to husbandry and the vineyard (Hos 10^{12}· 14^7), to the flowers of the field and other natural objects (10^4· 14^5), to the Divine judgment compared to the pains of travail (Hos 13^{13}; cf. Mt 24^8), to the chaff on the threshing-floor (Hos 13^3; cf. Mt 13^{30}, Lk 22^{31}), to select a few out of many. Might not the exercise of power in cursing the fig tree (an acted parable) be explained by a recollection of Hos 9^{10}? In a note on this passage in Cheyne's commentary we read: 'The white fig of Palestine ripens much before the black, sometimes as early as April, the ordinary fig harvest is not till the middle of August, but early ripe fruit might be found in June.' As God saw their fathers as 'the first-ripe in the fig tree at her first season,' and then they bitterly disappointed Him in their fulfilment of that early promise, so was it with Christ's generation, and that strange act became the most memorable and significant witness of the fact.

His favourite and oft-repeated phrase by which He spoke of His resurrection is also Hosean (Hos 6^2; cf. Mk 8^{31} 10^{34}, etc.). May not the ex postulation put into the mouth of the formalists in Mt $7^{21\text{-}22}$ be a reminiscence of Hos 8^2: 'They shall cry unto Me, My God, we Israel know Thee"; as well as, conversely, the bridegroom's condemnation in the Parable of the Ten Virgins (Mt 25^{12})?

But more important than these details is the whole trend of this great evangelical prophet's teaching. What Amos was to Hosea that was John the Baptist to our Lord. The deeper teaching on repentance, on God's character, on the love that suffereth to save—all this we find in the pages of this prophet, and we can see how truly akin to His spirit, who wept over Jerusalem while He denounced her sin, would be these tender yet trenchant passages of His forerunner.

G. CURRIE MARTIN.

Reigate.

'Catenae.'

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for February, Dr. Nestle drew attention to the great importance of Catenae. I should like to refer your readers to an article in the *Guardian* of 23rd February 1898, by Professor J. Armitage Robinson, on this subject, called forth by the same book that has received Dr. Nestle's notice.

It is impossible for anyone to study the catalogues of continental libraries without being struck by the number of the Catenae contained in them, and consequently realizing how much material awaits examination that might afford us either new texts or truer readings.

Dr. Westcott, in his article on 'Origen' in Smith's *D.C.B.*, suggested many years ago that Origen's

commentary on this Epistle might be recovered in its entirety, or at any rate in large measure by a study of Catenae; and, in his article in the *Guardian*, Professor Robinson takes up that suggestion, and appeals for work to be done in the department of Catenae, and especially in connexion with Origen's commentary on the Ephesians. He points out that much may be effected by a comparison of the Catena which was published by Cramer in 1842, and which contains professedly many fragments of Origen, with the commentary of Jerome on the Ephesians. It is well known that Jerome, in the preface of his commentary, admits his indebtedness to Origen.

If we look in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* for Origen's commentary on the Ephesians, we find, I think, only two or three short passages, one of them at least being in Latin. We are now able with the help of a Catena to go considerably further than Migne, and to gain a very fair idea of Origen's work on the Epistle.

In 1842 J. A. Cramer published, at Oxford, *Catenæ in Sancti Pauli Epistolas ad Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., Thes.* This was his collation of a MS. in the Paris Library, numbered cciv. in the Coislin collection. It formed only a small part of a large piece of work covering eight volumes, which in many cases was very hastily done. That part of the Catena which refers to the Ephesians contains citations from four writers, viz. Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, Severianus, and Origen. Dr. Swete employed this MS. very largely in preparing his edition of Theodore.

By the kindness of the trustees of the Hort Fund, I was enabled to proceed to Paris in July 1898 to collate this MS. afresh, with a view to recovering as much as possible of the text of Origen's commentary. I had only time to glance at a few other Catenae, but found nothing in them that could be assigned to Origen. The MS., which is of the eleventh century and is very clearly written, is in excellent condition.

When I compared my collation with Jerome, I was able to collect and restore thirty-nine fragments (some extending over several pages of Cramer's text), which belong undoubtedly to Origen. These fragments are nearly all named, but the great uncertainty with regard to them lay in determining how much of each might be given to Origen; the question also arose whether any of the anonymous fragments were his work, but I find that Chrysostom is responsible for nearly all. The continuous text of the Origen fragments which I prepared will be left in the hands of the trustees of the Hort Fund at Cambridge.

The chief interest which these fragments possess lies naturally in the knowledge they give us of Origen's exposition of the Epistle. They also contain references to early heresies, such as those of Marcion and Valentinus. We find (Cramer, p. 194, 23 and 208, 31) Origen speaking of the ἑτερόδοξοι διαχωρίζοντες δίκαιον Θεὸν ἀπὸ ἀγαθοῦ; of the ἑτερόδοξοι who are anxious διακόπτειν τὴν Θεότητα (p. 102, 27), and who think ἑτέρου εἶναι Θεοῦ τοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἄλλου τοὺς ἀποστόλους (p. 151, 15). In Cramer, p. 169, 27, there is a reference to Valentinus by name, where in a discussion of Eph 4^5, we read, διὰ τοὺς συγχέοντας πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν τὸ μὲν Κ-ύ-ρ-ι-ο-ς τέτακται ἐπὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, τὸ δὲ ε-ἷ-ς Θ-ε-ὸ-ς ἐπὶ τοῦ πατρὸς· καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Οὐαλεντίνου δὲ δύο διδόντας βαπτίσματα χρηστέον τῷ ῥητῷ ἓ-ν β-ά-π-τ-ι-σ-μ-α.

On p. 191, 5–7, we have, in a note on the word εὐχαριστία (Eph 5^4), an interesting piece of criticism. We are referred to Pr 11^{16}, and are told: ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἀκύλας οὕτως ἡρμήνευσεν 'γυνὴ χάριτος ἀντέχεται δόξης', Θεοδοτίων δὲ καὶ Σύμμαχος 'γυνὴ χάριτος ἀνθέξεται δόξης'.

As far as I can tell, this MS. contains citations from Origen in connexion with the Ephesians only.

Various passages which occur in this Catena are well known; especially that which has reference to the opening words of the Epistle, τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι, where Origen seems totally unaware of a reading ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

This Catena is one of peculiar value, and there is but little doubt that a further search in the Paris Library or elsewhere would reveal much that will permanently enrich our knowledge of patristic literature.

J. A. F. Gregg.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

1 Peter iii. 6.

Our commentaries are not yet realistic enough. Sarah, says the apostle, showed subjection and obedience to her husband Abraham, *calling him Lord.* The commentators explain this: 'Openly or publicly she acknowledged him as her lord.'

How much more from real life is the remark of the *Apostolic Constitutions*: 'She honoured him in as much as *she would not call him by his name*, but styled him lord, when saying, My Lord being old' (bk. 6, chap. 29: ὡς ἡ ἁγία Σάῤῥα τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ἐτίμα οὐδ' ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτὸν ὑπομένουσα καλεῖν, ἀλλὰ Κύριον αὐτὸν προσαγορεύουσα ἐν τῷ λέγειν· Ὁ δὲ κύριός μου πρεσβύτης). That the Septuagint gives another example of this custom from the Old Testament is remarked by Bengel and forgotten by our modern German commentators, namely, 1 S 1[8]: Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἐλκανὰ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· Ἄννα· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ κύριε· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Τί ἔστιν ὅτι κλαίεις. In the Codex Alexandrinus and five younger manuscripts this κύριε is omitted.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Crown of Life.

IN the interesting and suggestive paper by the Rev. W. Ernest Beet, published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for February, there occur one or two statements which seem somewhat unguarded. In particular the writer draws inferences in regard to the meaning of the word στέφανος which are hardly warranted by a full analysis of the passages in the New Testament where that word occurs. He declares that 'generally speaking' the word 'carries with it no suggestion of kingship or earthly rank, though a partial exception may be found in its use in the Gospels of the crown of thorns which was placed upon the Saviour's brow. . . . Elsewhere, however, its reference is to the athletic festivals of Greece.' The inference drawn from this is that where the word is used metaphorically the idea expressed is that of victory and not of sovereignty. It is doubtful, however, whether the latter idea can fairly be excluded.

The word στέφανος occurs in the N.T. eighteen times. Of these four have reference to the crown of thorns. In the remaining fourteen passages the word is used seven times in a literal sense and seven times in a metaphorical. Plainly, of course, its significance in the latter class of passages will largely depend upon the meaning it bears in the former. On examining these we find that only one (1 Co 9[25]) has 'reference to the athletic festivals of Greece.' In the remaining six (namely, Rev 4[4] 4[10] 6[2] 9[7] 12[1] and 14[14]) no such reference is suggested or implied. On the contrary, στέφανος in these passages distinctly carries with it the idea of kingship or exalted rank. On this point Thayer, *Lex.*, has the following note:—'Such passages in the Sept. as 2 S 12[30], 1 Ch 20[2], Ps 20 (21)[4], Ezk 21[26], Zec 6[11. 14] (yet cf. 2 S 1[10] Compl., Lag.) perhaps justify the doubt whether the distinction between στέφανος and διάδημα was strictly observed in Hellenistic Greek.'

One cannot therefore agree with Mr. Beet when he says that in the passages generally where στέφανος in a metaphorical sense occurs, and particularly in the passage of which he treats (Rev 2[10]) 'the crown spoken of is not the diadem of the sovereign, but the garland of the victorious athlete.' In fact he has based his exegesis of this text in Revelation upon the literal meaning which *St. Paul* attaches to στέφανος, overlooking the fact that in all the passages where *John himself* uses the word literally he attaches no such meaning to it. A comparison of the three passages (Rev 12[3] 13[1] 19[12]) in which John uses the word διάδημα will, I think, make plain that in his mind at least the two terms were practically synonymous.

JAMES H. MORRISON.

Aberdeen.

Job v. 5.

THE well-known Hebrew scholar, Mr. N. Herz, writes to me, under date 21st Jan. last, as follows:—

'In reading your note on "Zerah the Cushite" (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, May 1897), I was struck with your suggestion of an original מְזַנִּים in 2 Ch 14[15] 22[1]. It is scarcely necessary for me to point out to you that the Massor. text of Job 5[5] is corrupt. I should say that the copyist or redactor has blundered through dittography, and that the original was

אשר קצירו עֲרֵבִי יאכל
וְאַלְמְצִנִּים יקחהו
ושאפו עָצְמָם חֹגְלִים

Thus read, the passage would introduce us to tribes which one expects to find in a book like Job, *i.e. Arabs*, Μασονῖται = Ἀλιμαζονεῖς (2 Ch *l.c.*), and *Khawilæans*.'

In this ingenious and appropriate emendation of Job 5[5] I would now go a step farther. Every

reader of my *Ancient Heb. Tradition* is aware of the rôle played by *'Eber* (Hebrews) and *Ashur* (Edom and S. Palestine) in the most ancient times (*e.g.* in the prophecies of Balaam and the Minæan inscriptions, as well as elsewhere in certain O.T. set expressions, such as in Hos 9^3, Zec 10^{10}, Is 27^{13}). Hence it appears to me much more natural to emend the first line above thus—

אשור קצר ועבר אכל

and (following Mr. Herz in lines 2 and 3) to translate the whole as follows:—

'*Ashur* mows it (the harvest), '*Eber* eats it, and the tribe (Arab. *âl*) of the *Mazonîm* takes it, and the *Khawilæans* snap at their bones.'[1]

It is quite fitting that the author of the Book of Job, who elsewhere also intentionally lays the scene of his poem in the earliest times (cf. Job 2^{11}: Zophar, king of the Minæans), should here also in 5^5 introduce the well-known couple 'Eber and Ashûr side by side with the Mazonites and the Khawilæans. Besides, the emendation, especially that in lines 2 and 3, commends itself; it is one of those whose correctness is obvious at the first glance.

FRITZ HOMMEL.

Munich.

[1] For convenience of comparison I give the Massor. text,

אשר קצרו רעב יאכל
ואל מצנים יקחהו
ושאף צמים חילם

'whose harvest the hungry eateth up (ἃ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι συνήγαγον δίκαιοι ἔδονται), and taketh it even out of the thorns (αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐκ κακῶν οὐκ ἐξαίρετοι ἔσονται), and the robber swalloweth up their substance (ἐκσιφωνισθείη αὐτῶν ἡ ἰσχύς).'

Suppose the first line written defectively, אשר קצר רעב יאכל, my emendation to אשור קצר עבר אכל is still more obvious, רעב having arisen by dittography from קצר, and י in יאכל being a misreading of the final ר of עבר; that is to say—

from אשר קצר עבר אכל
arose by error אשר קצר רעב יאכל
or, with *scriptio plena* אשר קציורו רעב יאכל.

On the Meaning of ἐπιλαμβάνεται in Heb. ii. 16.

A SUGGESTION.

THAT the general idea is that of close association (as the bold paraphrase of the A.V. assumes) is evident. On the other hand, the rendering of the R.V., 'taketh hold of,' is no doubt verbally accurate. The metaphor, however, is felt, I think, to be a little harsh, unless there be some hint in the context to prepare for and explain it.

My suggestion is that we have such a hint in v.[13], where the picture is of one coming forward leading his children with him. On this view the full force of the word would be brought out by paraphrasing, 'It is not angels that He (thus) takes by the hand, but Abraham's seed.'

The only other passage where the word occurs in this Epistle is in 8^9, in a quotation from Jer 31^{32} (LXX, 38^{32}), referring to the bringing up of Israel from Egypt, where we have the full phrase with τ. χειρός. Lk 9^{47}, if the genitive be the correct reading, is a good illustration of the use in the present passage (ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίου ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ' ἑαυτῷ).

The fact that two verses intervene is not, I think, against the proposed connexion of thought, for it is rather this writer's manner to resume with γάρ after a parenthesis, *e.g.* 2^5 resumes the subject from $1^{13.\ 14}$.

The present tense, contrasting with the aorist of v.[14] is quite natural if it refers back to the picture which v.[13] suggests.

W. MONTGOMERY.

Theological College, Guilford Street, W.C.

A Parallel to Rom. xii. 11.

To the variant τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες for τῷ κυρίῳ a very nice parallel is found in Bar 1^{14}. There we read ἐν ἡμέραις καιροῦ. The A.V. had 'solemn days,' the R.V. makes 'days of the solemn assembly,' presupposing, apparently, that the unusual Greek expression corresponds to Hebrew יְמֵי מוֹעֵד (Hos 12^{10}). But it deserves notice that the Syriac version has 'in the days *of the Lord*,' reading Κυρίου for καιροῦ. I do not know why in the *Variorum Apocrypha* this interesting variant remained unnoticed; the more reason why it may be mentioned here.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Further Contributions to Textual Criticism.

1. 1 S 1^6. The Revised Version gives: 'And her rival provoked her sore, for to make her fret,

because the LORD had shut up her womb.' It was a service to students of archæology thus to promulgate Lagarde's interpretation of צָרָה 'a rival- or fellow-wife' (see Dr. Driver's note in his *Text of Samuel*), but the Revisers were too timid when they retained the inherited rendering of בְּעֶבְרוֹר הַהֲעָמָה. הֵרְעִים is a common word, and elsewhere only means 'to thunder,' usually with reference to Yahwè. Löhr remarks that the versions give no help, and that he has not met with any acceptable conjecture. For his own part, he suggests that רעמה may possibly have come from דמעה, 'tears.' I think a probable conjecture *can* be made. In 2 S 12[21] Wellhausen, Klostermann, Grätz, Perles (*Analekten*, p. 23), have rightly corrected בַּעֲבוּר into בְּעוֹד (following Lucian's recension of LXX, and the Syriac); cf. also note on Ps 39[2] in Cheyne, *Psalms*, ed. 2. I suggest that we should correct the text of 1 S 1[6] thus: בְּוֹדָהּ עֲרִירִיָּה, 'while she was yet childless.' For רי to be mistaken for מ would not be at all difficult, especially in an older form of the script. The sense produced fits the context perfectly.

2. 2 S 12[26-31]. I return to this passage, partly treated of already in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (December 1897, pp. 143 f.; cf. June 1898, p. 428). R.V. introduces a noteworthy improvement into A.V.'s rendering of v.[30]. Where A.V. gives 'the weight whereof was a talent of gold with the precious stones,'—the reference is to the crown of the king, or rather (see R.V. mg.) the god of Ammon,—R.V. has 'the weight, etc., and (in it were) precious stones.' Both versions continue, 'and it was set on David's head.' The inserted words, 'in it were' = וּבָהּ (so Pesh., Targ., Vulg., in agreement with 1 Ch 20[2]). Now the question arises, Is the plural, 'precious stones,' in accordance with the narrator's meaning? or should we rather render 'precious stone,' in which case it may be merely the 'precious stone' (אבן יקרה) which David wore on his headgear? The latter is the supposition of Klostermann, and whatever the view of the compiler may have been, I imagine that Klostermann has probably caught the meaning of the original tradition. It was an amulet, like all precious stones (Pr 17[8]), but of more than ordinary potency, for the idol of Milcom was not a mere idol to Israelites of the age of David. Evidently the narrator takes a great interest in what may be called the dethronement of Milcom. If my conjecture in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, *l.c.*, is correct, he gives Rabbath Ammon the special title 'city of Milcom' (עיר מלכם to be read for עיר המלוכה in v.[26], and for עיר המים in v.[27]). And now, in v.[30], he chronicles the removal of Milcom's crown and the transference of the 'precious stone,' which decorated the crown and protected its wearer, to the head of David. As to the treatment of the Ammonites by David, something may be added here to supplement Driver's note in *Text of Samuel*, pp. 226 ff. Really it is quite needless to frame conjectures as to the obscure word rendered in R.V. 'axes' (מגזרות). The words מ' הברזל are not improbably a correction of the faulty reading במגרה (rendered in R.V. 'under (?) saws'), which has found its way into the text. But the ז appears to be intrusive; what the margin originally read was בַּמְּגֵרוֹת. I doubt the correctness of the preceding word (הברזל) חרצי, which I suspect to have come from גרזי, and this from מגזרות (dittographed). The Ammonites were probably set to work with saws, *i.e.* at sawing timber or (1 K 7[9]) stone.

3. 2 K 23[13]. E.V.: 'And the high places that were before Jerusalem, which were on the right hand of the mount of corruption' (A.V. mg., 'that is, the mount of Olives'; R.V. mg., 'or destruction'). There has been much discussion as to the origin of the title (הר המשחית) here given (as it appears) to the mount of Olives. Some, both in ancient and in modern times, have thought there was an allusion in some way to the Aram. word מְשַׁח, 'oil.' Rashi supposed a paronomasia; G. Hoffmann (*ZATW.* ii. 175) and Perles (*Analekten*, p. 31) would rather read הַר־הַמִּשְׁחָה, 'mount of oil.' But there is no evidence of the existence of a Hebrew word משחה, 'oil.' In 2 S 15[32] we read: 'And when David had come to the summit, where it is men's wont to worship the deity' (אשר ישתחוה שם לאלהים): I infer from this that the mount of Olives may have been anciently called הַר־הַמִּשְׁתַּחֲוִים 'the mount of those who worship.' הר־המשחית would be a purely accidental corruption of this.

4. In 2 Ch 28[15] the A.V. and the R.V. ask us to believe that 'all the feeble' of the captives of Judah taken by Pekah, king of Israel, were 'carried upon asses and (so) brought to Jericho.' But וינהלום בחמרים cannot, in accordance with usage, be rendered 'and carried them upon asses': לְכָל־כּוֹשֵׁל is also suspicious (three ל, two כ).

There is a large error in the text. Read וַיְכַלְכְּלוּם בְּחֶמְאָה וְקֶלִי וַעֲדָשִׁים, 'and they sustained them with soured milk and parched corn and lentils' (cf. 2 S 17[28-29]). ינהל and יכלכל have a tendency to get confounded (see Ball on Gn 47[18]; Cheyne on Ps 31[4] [*Psalms*, ed. 2]). The refreshing qualities of soured milk are as much believed in by the natives of Palestine and Arabia in our day as in ancient times (Jg 5[25]). *Laban* is still offered as a refreshment to the traveller in Palestine, as many know.

5. Ezk 9[2]. In the sombre narrative of the (ideal) destruction of the wicked in Jerusalem we meet, in E.V., with the term 'slaughter-weapon.' The Hebrew is כְּלִי מַפָּצוֹ. Cornill has already pointed out that the closing words of v.[1] are identical with the clause relative to the 'slaughter-weapon' (?) in v.[2], and infers, very naturally, that it is a variant of that clause. Cornill himself retains כְּלִי מַפָּצוֹ. But we do not know of any Hebrew word מַפָּץ. משחתו (so point, not משחתו) gives a good sense. We may surely be allowed to prefer the better to the worse Hebrew reading, and read כלי משחתו both in v.[1] and in v.[2]. The rendering 'battle axe' for כְּלִי מַפָּץ in the margin of R.V. is rather hard to justify.

6. Ezk 38[12], Jg 9[37]. R.V. renders the closing words of Ezk., *l.c.*, thus: 'That dwell in the middle of the land,' with a margin, 'Heb. *navel*. See Jg 9[37].' In Judges, *l.c.*, it renders: 'See, there come people down by the middle (Heb. *navel*) of the land, and one company cometh by the way of the oak of Meonenim.' Dr. Winckler, who has such an unusually keen eye for problems, historical and textual, thinks that in both passages there is a reference to the 'mountain of the gods' (see the commentators on Is 14[13], Ezk 28[14]). Jg 9[37] contains, he thinks, a poetical quotation, which is only mechanically inserted into the narrative. Ezk 38[12] is a part of a mythic story respecting Gog, who was expected to come and destroy those who dwell on the 'navel of the earth,' *i.e.* on the mountain of the gods (cf. Loki in the great Teutonic epic). I am afraid the phrase טביר הארץ will not bear the weight laid upon it. In Ezk, *l.c.*, we should probably read עַל־בָּמֳתֵי אֶרֶץ, 'on the high places of the land.' The allusion in the phrase, *those who dwell* עַל־ב׳ א׳, is to Dt 32[13], 'He made him ride on the high places of the land,' on which see Driver's note; cf. also Dt 33[29], Hab 3[19], Ps 18[34]. The transposition and confusion of letters which this theory presupposes is not more surprising here than in many similar cases. In the other passage (Jg 9[37]) טבור הארץ is also no doubt an error. That בָּמַת הָעִיר, 'the high place of the city,' is satisfactory I do not venture to say. Grätz thinks that טבור הארץ is a dittogram of ראש האחד (ארץ for אחד again in 1 K 8[37]); for מֵעִם he reads מִיָּם, 'from the west.' Probably this is right. טור=רות=ראש. ב would be one of those intrusive letters which we cannot help recognizing in some corrupt words; for an instance see 2 S 12[21], where, as noticed above, בעבור has arisen out of בעור.

7. Zec 11[2] [3]. Professor G. A. Smith finely renders 'for fallen is the impenetrable wood.' But neither יַעַר הַבָּצוּר (adopted by this scholar and by R.V.) nor יַעַר הַבָּצִיר (adopted by A.V.) is free from objection. The latter, which is the reading of the Hebrew text, brings Bashan into a strange connexion with vineyards; the former is an unparalleled expression, and does not give quite a satisfactory sense (had the oaks of Bashan never been cut down, like the cedars of Lebanon?). Duhm's correction of the difficult במערצה in Is 10[33] suggests the course to be adopted. Read בְּמַעֲצָד, 'with the axe'; the confusions of letters are such as were constantly made by the scribes.

8. Hab 3[4], Ps 81[8]. In Hab for קרנים, 'horns,' read בְּרָקִים, 'lightnings' (cf. Ps 77[19]), and in Ps for בְּסֵתֶר רַעַם, 'in the covert of thunder,' read בְּצֵאת בְּרָקִים, 'when lightnings went forth.'

I do not apologize for the length to which these notes have run, because textual and archæological criticism are the two departments in which there is the most pressing need for a long step forward in our commentaries on the Old Testament.

T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

On Mark xii. 42.

SINCE my discussion on Mk 12[42] (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, January, p. 185) is vigorously combated by such a high authority as Professor W. M. Ramsay (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES,

February, p. 232), I must add a few words more. I grant that my expression, 'The Roman coins, like the *quadrans*, were in circulation throughout the whole Roman empire,' was inexact. It is quite true that, as Professor Ramsay says, the provincial cities and communities struck their own bronze small change in vast quantities, whereas they struck no gold coins and but very little silver coins. But this hardly affects the question, because they struck their bronze coins partly, or mostly, if not according to the Roman system, at least with the Roman designations. See Mommsen, *Römisches Münzwesen*, p. 708, and especially p. 718, where he states that in Syria, since the time of Augustus, a great quantity of bronze coins were struck, which bore in Latin the name of the Emperor, and the Latin letters S C. Of course these coins had their Latin names; hence ἀσσάριον = *as*, in Matthew and Luke, and κοδράντης, *quadrans* (= ¾ of an *as*), not only in Mark but also in Matthew (5[26]), τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην, a phrase which abundantly proves that the κοδράντης too was a familiar coin in the eastern provinces. It does not affect the case whether the word κοδράντης is found in inscriptions or not; there was very rarely, only in cases quite exceptional, occasion for using the name of so small a coin. How then can Professor Ramsay say, 'If the *quadrans* had been familiar to the Greeks, it is practically certain that epigraphy would contain references to the familiar coin'? The fact that the *quadrans* was familiar is further proved by the Hellenized form of the word; for *quadrans*, properly transcribed, gives κουάδρας, -αντος (like Κλημης, -εντος), and not κοδράντης; cp. ἀσσάριον instead of *as*, δηνᾶριον instead of denārius.

F. Blass.

Halle.

Kirjath-arba.

Judges i. 10.

What did the name Kirjath-arba originally signify? קִרְיַת, of course = 'city of,' but what is the derivation of אַרְבַּע.

1. Professor Sayce accepts the old interpretation that the city was so called from a man named Arba (*Monuments*, p. 189), but this notion is ably controverted by Dr Moore (*The International Critical Commentary*) in his note on Jg 1[10].

2. Fürst thinks אַרְבַּע is equivalent to אַרְבַּעַל, and means 'hero of Baal.' A more plausible theory would be that אַרְבַּעַל = 'hearth *or* altar of Baal' (cf. *Ariel*, 'hearth of God,' Is 29[1], Ezk 43[15]; in latter R.V. has 'altar hearth'). As the site of the present mosque of Hebron was doubtless, in ancient times, a sanctuary, the name 'city of the hearth of Baal' would be very apposite.

3. Dr. Moore says the meaning of the name is probably *Tetrapolis*, and Professor Hommel confirms this by a reference to the Tel el-Amarna tablets, where we find Hebron 'mentioned by its old name, Rubûti (= Roba'ôt), meaning the four quarters of the city' (*Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 234). When the philologist and the archæologist are agreed, I suppose we must rest content; but considering the character of the place, a sacred etymology would, on *a priori* grounds, seem more correct.

Considering the changes and corruptions which proper names compounded with 'Baal' underwent, may not Fürst be on the right track in his emendation, אַרְבַּעַל; and instead of 'hero (*lit.* lion) of Baal' or 'hearth of Baal,' may we not translate 'Ari is Lord'? Professor Hommel tells us that there was a god Yara or Ari, 'who is probably identical with Ari in the O.T. Ariel' (*Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 224).

Augustus Poynder.

Weston-super-Mare.

Patristic Evidence as to the Grundschrift of the Acts of the Apostles.

Before touching on certain evidence which is forthcoming, so it seems to me, in the *Ancient Syriac Documents* translated by Cureton, and in that curious interpolation in the *Clementine Recognitions*, i. 43–74 (entirely absent from the *Homilies*, and, according to Lightfoot, derived from an older Ebionite work, *The Ascents of James*), it is necessary to recall briefly the analysis of Acts made by Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, vii. 31).

Ewald pointed out, and his view has been repeatedly endorsed, that certain sections relating to St. Peter and to the local Jerusalemite Church interrupted another narrative prefatory to St. Paul's history, and that the edges of the latter were still raw. The Samaritan mission of Peter and John

(Ac 8^{4-40}) separates the beginning of Paul's havoc from his journey to Damascus. Peter's Cæsarean journey (Ac 9^{31}–11^{18}) separates Paul's arrival in Tarsus from his recall. Peter's imprisonment (Ac 12^{1-24}) separates Paul's relief mission to Jerusalem from his return to headquarters. And in Ac 15^{35} the thread of the narrative is taken up from 14^{28}, the exact point at which the council of Jerusalem, the last Petrine section in Acts, interrupted it. Together with these four sections, presuming this cleavage to be correct, must be reckoned an earlier four, viz. the presage of the Samaritan mission (Ac 1^{6-8}); the great Petrine section (Ac 3–5^{16}), commencing with Peter and John's miracle at the Gate Beautiful, which is obviously from the same pen as their Samaritan mission; and the appointment of Matthias and the deacons (Ac 1^{15-26} 6^{1-6}). When these eight sections have been removed, there remains a narrative fairly coherent, in which the great event of Pentecost ensues immediately on the Ascension, and is at once followed by the trial of all the apostles before the Sanhedrin, and the martyrdom of Stephen.

Into the various arguments from style and matter by which this analysis is supported, this is not the place to enter. The chief objections are that there is greater similarity of style between the two narratives than can well be accounted for by redaction, and that the Petrine sections depend on the others, especially with regard to Pentecost (see Ac 4^{31} 8^{16} 11^{15}). But these objections lose their force if, instead of following Ewald to his conclusion that two documents have been combined, we suppose that only the pre-Pauline narrative pre-existed in separate form, and that the author of the Petrine sections worked over it,—wave, as it were, going over wave. It is with a feeling that Ewald's conclusions have been refuted only on this side issue that one approaches the question whether in early Christian literature there are no references which indicate the existence of this Grundschrift minus the eight Petrine intercalations, and together with them the editorial preface to Theophilus. Two such references are probably forthcoming.

Firstly, — In Cureton's 'Teaching of the Apostles' we read that Christ ascended at about 6 a.m. *on the day of Pentecost*, and that the tongues of fire descended as soon as the apostles returned to the upper chamber. Thus the appointment of Matthias is precluded, and also the 'forty days.' This is no isolated reference. In five other passages of these Edessene documents ('Ante-Nicene Library,' vol. xx. pt. ii. pp. 13, 38, 40, 90) the Ascension is fixed on the day of Pentecost, and it was celebrated by the Edessene Church on that day. One may add that the explicit mention of the return to the upper chamber in Ac $1^{12.13}$ seems to be prefatory to 2^{1}.

Secondly,—In the interpolation in the *Recognitions* before mentioned, it is several times clearly stated (i. 53, 43, 44), and stress is laid on the fact, that the interview of *all* the apostles with the Sanhedrin described in Ac 5^{17-42} was their first appearance before that body since the Crucifixion, thus excluding Peter and John's appearance (Ac 4). Of the identity of this meeting with that described in Ac 5^{17-42} there can be no doubt, for *all* the apostles are present, Gamaliel intervenes, and the meeting ends with the apostles being beaten. There is of course no denying that this narrative is somewhat discredited by its obvious *tendency*, for it is no trial scene that we have, but a friendly colloquy with the Sanhedrin; and if, in the end, the apostles get beaten, it is not by judicial decision, but at the hands of an invading mob led by Paul. But there is no sufficient ground for supposing that the author would distort his authorities further than his tendency required.

Our author proceeds to relate that Paul's havoc ensued immediately after this assault, that the apostles dispersed, Peter going down to Jericho, and that Paul at once set off for Damascus. This, too, may partly be accounted for by *tendency*. The narrator's object being to minimize all idea of friction with Judaism, he would pass over Stephen's martyrdom naturally. But would he, with Ac 8^{1} in his hands ('dispersed, except the apostles who remained in Jerusalem'), have quite needlessly related the flight to Jericho?

In fine, though there are some contrary phenomena in the two authorities above quoted (*e.g.* a mention of Matthias in *Recognitions*, i. 60, and of our complete Acts in the 'Teaching'), yet this objection does not go far, considering the amount of knocking about and re-editing that both authorities have undergone. What we have before us cannot indeed be a direct reflexion of the Grundschrift of Acts, but when the coincidence with Ewald's conclusions is taken into account, there seems good ground for inferring a reflexion that is indirect through some early Ebionite medium.

F. P. Badham.

Temple, London.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Recently in The Expository Times, the aged and saintly Bishop of Gloucester expressed the hope that he might be found fit to share in the first resurrection. He believed that each passing generation was sending up its saintly contingent to share in it. Mr. Rayner Winterbotham says it cannot be. It is not possible, he says, for any Christian of the present generation to share in the first resurrection.

Mr. Winterbotham has published a volume of sermons on the Parables of the Kingdom. At the end of the sermons come four excursuses. The second excursus is 'On Suffering as a Note of the Kingdom of Heaven.' It is there that he expresses the impossibility. He says 'that unless the apostle was strangely deceived, or used extremely misleading language, it is not possible for any Christian of the present generation to share in the first resurrection.'

But he says much more than that. He says that it is not possible for any of us to appropriate any of the future glories and heavenly rewards of the Kingdom. For they are uniformly connected in Scripture with the endurance of persecution and tribulation in this life. We do not suffer tribulation and persecution. We cannot suffer so. Outside the Turkish Empire and a few dark places of the earth, it is not possible, he says, for anyone to suffer so, and therefore it is not possible for anyone to look forward to receiving the crown of life or sharing in the first resurrection.

The rewards of the New Testament are the rewards of suffering. 'Who are these that are arrayed in white robes, and whence came they? These are they that came out of the great tribulation.' 'If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him.' Mr. Winterbotham even recalls the position which the 'Kingdom' holds in the passage which introduces the Apocalypse. 'I, John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ' (Rev 1^{9}). It expresses the apostolic conception of the Kingdom, of the position of those who belong to it. 'Nothing,' says Mr. Winterbotham, 'could be more simply effective than the position of the "Kingdom" in this sentence. It is identified, by the mere arrangement of the words, with persecution from without, with patient endurance from within.'

Mr. Winterbotham does not mean that we cannot be 'saved' without persecutions. 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' He believes that we can even live our Christian life without persecution, and without very much tribulation. It was not so at first. 'In the world ye shall have tribulation' expressed an actual and universal fact at first. And the apostolic statement, 'All that would live godly in

Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution,' was literally true at first. But he holds that if we do live our Christian life without persecution, we cannot serve ourselves heir to the promises.

Do we claim the ordinary ills of life as tribulation? Surely there are some to whom they are tribulation enough. But Mr. Winterbotham will not allow it. These, he says, are not the tribulation of the Christian. These are the ills that flesh is heir to. They are the loss that is common to the race. 'It is everywhere represented that our Lord's disciples would meet with trial and suffering peculiar to themselves; and the patient enduring of such trial and suffering is made the basis and condition of their heavenly reward.'

And so Mr. Winterbotham will not allow us to claim even the precious words of the Apocalypse: 'They shall hunger no more, neither shall they thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat.' He knows what comfort, what joy, what a blessed foretaste of good things to come, these words have afforded to Christian people. But he says it is impossible to pretend that the good people whose dying hours are soothed to-day with these Scriptures have come out of the great tribulation. 'As a rule, they have had no tribulation worth speaking of, and certainly not that of which the elder spake.'

And he takes from us even our place in the Millennium. He accepts the Millennium literally, 'according to the common belief of the earliest Christian ages.' The saints shall reign with Christ, and for a thousand years. But who are the saints? Those who have been *beheaded* for the testimony of Jesus. The word does not necessarily mean that the head has been struck off. The word which St. John uses is a peculiar one — coined perhaps by St. John himself, as 'guillotined' and 'macheted' have been coined in recent times. It does not need that everyone should have been actually killed with the Roman axe (the word here used). But it does need that they have been martyrs for the gospel. And it is not reason, says Mr. Winterbotham, but an impudent determination to make what we please of the Word of God, if we extend it to amiable and easy-going people who have never suffered anything at all for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake.

Professor Bruce's new book on *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (T. & T. Clark, post 8vo, pp. 463, 7s. 6d.) contains a chapter of special interest on 'The Theological Significance of the Epistle.' In that chapter Professor Bruce says that the doctrine of Christ's priesthood is 'a theological specialty' of this Epistle. 'Practically,' he adds, 'this is the only book of the New Testament in which that doctrine finds any, or at least adequate, recognition.'

But what is the doctrine of Christ's priesthood? Professor Bruce says it is not so narrow a thing as dogmatic theology has made it. Dogmatic theology has thought there is only one idea in it. But this writer is not a man of one idea. He firmly believes in the sacrificial character of Christ's death; it is a cardinal point of his theology. But that is not the only aspect under which he views the event. He handles the topic with great freedom. And Professor Bruce finds it presented under five phases, of which he gives an enumeration, beginning with the lowest and most elementary view, and rising gradually to the highest.

The most elementary view of the death of Christ is found in Heb 9^{27}. Jesus died once, and once only, as it is appointed unto all men once to die. On this view Christ's death is simply an instance of the common lot. The next is seen in 9^{16}. When Jesus died He left a will bequeathing an inheritance. On this the manner of the death is nothing, it might be by disease or accident. All that is necessary is that, being a testator, He be known to be dead. The next is earlier, Heb 2^{10}. The death of Jesus was the climax of a varied

experience of suffering, through which He was qualified to be a Captain of salvation. Crucifixion, with all that went before it, was a discipline for Himself, not a sacrifice for others. The next follows closely, $2^{14.15}$. Jesus though sinless died. Thus the close connexion between sin and death as its penalty is broken, and sinful men are delivered from the fear of death as penal. The idea is not yet that the Sinless One dies instead of the sinful, only that though sinless He dies, and no emphasis is laid on the manner of the death. The last is found in 10^{14}. The death of Jesus was a *priestly act of self-sacrifice* whereby He 'perfected for ever them that are sanctified.'

All these views helped the Hebrew Christians to see why Jesus had to die. Dogmatic theology has made little use of any but the last. Dr. Bruce admits that it is by far the most important view. But he thinks it is a great ethical loss that so little has been made of the third view. Christ's experience of suffering was for His own sake in the first place. But it is invested with a unique ethical interest for us. It carries the interest of a heroic life lived under the hardest conditions. His whole suffering experience, including His death, is seen to be the natural result of His moral fidelity. The cross came to Him because He cared supremely for the Divine interest and for duty.

'Professor Hort and the "Te Deum"' is the title of an article by President Thompson of Philadelphia in the American *Sunday School Times* for 4th March. The purpose of the article is to prove the early origin of the 'Te Deum.' It includes a long letter from Professor Hort of Cambridge.

The 'Te Deum' and the 'Gloria in Excelsis,' says President Thompson, differ from the other hymns of the Latin Church, not only in their grandeur, but also in their composition. The earliest Latin verse was characterized by accent and rhyme. Then came the period of Greek predominance in literature, and Roman verse lost its metre in imitating the Greek succession of long and short vowels or quantity. But the popular songs in Latin were probably always rhymed. And the time came when Pope Damasus ignored the classical models of Horace and Virgil, and composed his hymns in accented and rhymed verse after the manner of the popular songs. By and by the Irish and Anglo-Saxon writers added alliteration. But the 'Te Deum' and the 'Gloria in Excelsis' have neither rhyme nor accent nor quantity nor alliteration.

They are modelled, to all appearance, not on the Latin or Greek poetry, whether classical or popular, but upon the Hebrew Psalms. Dr. Thompson thinks that all the earliest Christian hymns were modelled on the Psalms. 'When ye come together,' says St. Paul to the Corinthians, 'each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation' (1 Co 14^{26}). Does he simply mean that persons selected a Psalm from the Old Testament Psalter to read or recite? Dr. Thompson does not think so. The 'psalm' like the 'teaching,' the 'revelation,' the 'tongue,' and the 'interpretation' was evidently something original. Dr. Thompson understands that the Christians in Corinth were producing Christian psalms after the Hebrew model.

Then the only examples of these earliest Christian hymns that have come down to us are the 'Gloria in Excelsis' and the 'Te Deum.' The 'Gloria in Excelsis' was originally written in Greek. Its Greek original has been preserved. But the Latin translation is very early. The 'Te Deum' must have been written in Latin originally.

The proof of the very early origin of the 'Te Deum' is twofold. First, there is the Hebraic form of structure already mentioned. And next, there is a notable coincidence in three of its verses (7–9) with a passage in the writings of Cyprian. In his treatise, 'Concerning Immortal-

ity,' written in 253 or 254 A.D., Cyprian encourages his flock against the fear of death at the hands of the persecutors. He holds out hopes of reunion with the beloved dead. 'There the great company of our dear ones—parents, brothers, children—awaits us, and the abundant throng of those who in their own security are none the less concerned for our salvation; there the glorious choir of the apostles, there the exulting company of the prophets, there of martyrs multitude beyond number.' The connexion with the 'Te Deum' is obvious. And Dr. Thompson sees clear evidence, in the greater vividness and concreteness of the hymn, that Cyprian quoted the 'Te Deum,' not the 'Te Deum' Cyprian. He would therefore locate the 'Te Deum' in Africa, and date it in the age of Cyprian, if not earlier.

But there is a difficulty. In the end of the hymn there are phrases which are clearly taken from Jerome's Vulgate, and Jerome did not finish his Vulgate till 404 A.D. President Thompson believes that the last eight verses of the 'Te Deum,' in which the Vulgate phrases occur, are no part of the original poem, but were added by a later hand. It was in support of that belief that he sought the assistance of Professor Hort.

Professor Hort's letter was long, but very cautious. He could not say that the first two parts of the 'Te Deum' were wholly dependent on the Old Latin versions which Jerome worked on for his Vulgate. There are two words which point that way: *Sabaoth* (of i. 5) is the Old Latin reading against Jerome's *exercituum*, and *mortis aculeo* (of i. 17) is Old Latin against the Vulgate *stimulus mortis*. But both phrases are probably due to liturgical recollection, and not directly to an Old Latin version. On the other hand, there is nothing in the first two parts of the 'Te Deum' which demand dependence on the Vulgate. Professor Hort allows Dr. Thompson to maintain his argument of the composite character of the 'Te Deum' and the early origin of its first two parts.

When the Rev. J. H. Jowett of Birmingham preached in Wolverhampton, on the Sunday after the sudden death of Dr. Berry, he told an anecdote of Dr. Berry's ministerial life. He said, 'Sometime ago I travelled with Dr. Berry to London. We had the compartment to ourselves, and unveiled to each other the secrets of our spiritual life.' Dr. Berry told him that when he began his ministerial life he never mentioned the Atonement, and seldom spoke of the Cross. But one dreary November night he was called to see a dying woman. He was led into the lowest part of the town of Bolton, down a narrow street, into a court, up two or three flights of stairs. 'I found I was in a brothel'; in a corner of the garret lay the dying woman. 'I told the woman that God was her Father, and she was His child. There was no response. I then told her the story of the Prodigal Son, but it awakened no ripple of interest. I told her how the Magdalene had been turned from a sinner to a saint. She seemed to get no nearer to the peace she sought. Then, Jowett, bit by bit there was dragged out of me the story of the Crucified, as I heard it at my mother's knee. She awoke; and, Jowett, I think we got her in.'

Mr. Jowett's sermon was reported in the *Independent* of 9th February. Next week there was published in the *Independent* a letter from the Rev. John Hunter, D.D., of Glasgow. 'I read with surprise and sorrow,' said Dr. Hunter, 'Mr. Jowett's somewhat sensational statement in last week's *Independent* of a conversation he had with Dr. Berry in a railway carriage.' Then Dr. Hunter used language about the morbid cravings of the crowd, which was not without justification, but is not our present concern. But he added: 'I am quite sure Mr. Jowett (unintentionally, no doubt) misrepresents our departed friend. Dr. Berry was a many-sided man, but he was, I think, the last man to

put up an ignorant and superstitious strumpet in the last mortal sickness, as a qualified interpreter and judge of our deeper human needs, and of what is most divine in the Christian gospel. Mr. Jowett's version of the incident reads to me like a parody of what Dr. Berry told me, five years ago, in Aberdeen, when I had some long talks with him on deep subjects; and the application of it, I think, is somewhat strained and unfair. It was told to me in another connexion and for another purpose.'

Now it happened that on another page of the same issue of the *Independent* which contained Dr. Hunter's letter, there appeared some notes copied from the *Free Methodist*. The notes were recollections of Dr. Berry, contributed to the *Free Methodist* by the Rev. Thomas Law. Mr. Law said it was well known that Dr. Berry's theological views had very much changed during recent years. In the early days of his ministry he was one of the leaders of what was known as the advanced modern school of theology, 'and in effect, he preached that the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice was an immoral doctrine. I shall never forget his telling me—when we first crossed the Channel together—what brought about the change.' And then Mr. Law told the story of 'the ignorant and superstitious strumpet.'

Mr. Law's version of that story differs from Mr. Jowett's. Mr. Law says it was a girl that Dr. Berry was called to see; Mr. Jowett says that a girl came to Dr. Berry's door, but that it was her mother she asked him to come and see. Mr. Law says that Dr. Berry did not feel he had much fitness for such work, and suggested that another minister in the neighbourhood should be called; Mr. Jowett says only that he had never been asked to do anything so practical, and 'was half inclined to shirk it.' Mr. Law says that Dr. Berry spoke of the beauty of a noble life, the worth of goodness, and the reward of right doing; Mr. Jowett says definitely that he told her of the Fatherhood of God. Mr. Law says that then by one plunge he went back to the most old-fashioned theology, and said to the girl, 'Jesus Christ died for you; He died in your stead, and if you will only believe in Him and accept Him as your personal Saviour, all your sins will be forgiven'; and he adds that immediately he spoke to her in that way she rested as quietly on her pillow as if she were resting her head on her mother's bosom. Mr. Jowett simply says that the story of the Crucified was dragged out of him bit by bit, and that then she awoke, and, 'Jowett, I think we got her in.'

The details are different. But the story is the same. The centre of it is unmoved. Dr. Berry became a preacher of what he once called an immoral doctrine, and it was the practical necessity of preaching to a 'strumpet' that wrought the change. This story may be remembered when we set ourselves to the criticism of the Gospels.

But the most significant thing in the whole incident is the reference made by Dr. Hunter to the 'ignorant and superstitious strumpet in the last mortal sickness.' Dr. Hunter does not consider such an one 'a qualified interpreter and judge of our deeper human needs, and of what is most divine in the Christian gospel.' The phrase has much the same sound as the kind of consolation which Dr. Berry is reported to have offered the woman first. It really means that Dr. Hunter has no gospel for such a woman, and he is not ashamed to say it. But Jesus had a gospel for her. When He came, there were the two classes of people—the righteous who needed no repentance, and the sinners who, as the righteous said, needed it very much, but would never get it. Jesus came to give repentance and the remission of sins to the sinner. 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.' He reckoned this woman the very person who could interpret and judge our deeper human needs, the very person who needed and could recognize what was most divine in the Christian gospel.

Recent Literature on the Text of the New Testament.

By Ada Bryson, M.A., Manchester.

Despite the recent additions to the literature on Greek Testament Criticism, Dr. Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* still remains the standard work. The student will probably gain from it too some of that love for the subject which pervades the book. Dr. Scrivener is wholly unrivalled or unapproached in his particular department: a patient and accurate observer of textual phenomena, very fair and impartial, he is not merely an advocate for his own reading, but has been adjudged almost an arbiter. He represents the older and stricter ideas; his position is midway between Burgon and Westcott-Hort: he never displayed the bigotry of Burgon, although he sided with him on a number of important points. His last edition (1894) is much increased in bulk. He explains the nature of Textual Criticism, and the different kinds of errors likely to arise in transmission, describes the ancient manuscripts and versions (valuable facsimiles of which are given), and brings the work down, through the printed editions, to the Revised Version. He then explains the nature of internal evidence, gives a history of the text with recent views on Comparative Criticism, and examines and condemns Dr. Hort's theory. He has a good chapter on the Dialect of the Greek Testament, and concludes by applying his principles to the criticism of certain selected passages. In these he keeps to the older views.

Good work has also been done in his *New Testament in the original Greek according to the A.V. Greek and the variations adopted by the Revisers*. This work clearly shows the exact amount of variation made by the revisers from the Greek text followed in 1611.

A very much shorter work is Hammond's *Outlines of Textual Criticism*, which was written before there was any good textual Introduction shorter than Scrivener's. He uses Scrivener, and gives briefly his conclusions. He also very slightly sketches Dr. Hort's system in the new edition brought up to the year 1890. For those who want an Introduction without the details of the larger work, this would be useful.

A new departure was made in 1881, when Drs. Westcott and Hort published their edition of the Greek Testament, followed a few months later by Dr. Hort's *Introduction*. They aimed not at producing a fourth century text, but at getting back to the autographs themselves, and their method of procedure in doing this is undoubtedly the best to trust to. Dean Burgon held that the text ought to be settled by numbers, and claims that of the whole mass of evidence — MSS. versions and Fathers—nineteen-twentieths support the traditional text. Dr. Hort applied an entirely new system; he says MSS., like men, have a genealogy, and we must know something of this before we can estimate their worth. Griesbach had enunciated this doctrine at the end of last century, but it was left to Westcott and Hort to found upon it a system of textual criticism which has gained the consent of most of the present textual scholars. First, the solitary MSS. and versions are arranged in families. It is found that a certain number of authorities have a tendency to exhibit the same readings, so these are grouped together into three great families. When the groups are thus formed, the effort is made to trace their history. Here the MSS. themselves give help. In a certain number of instances, when one group offers a special reading and the second group offers another, the third group is found to combine the two. Is this combined reading (to which Hort gives the name of 'conflate') likely to be older than the two separate readings, or are they likely to be older than it? Is it more likely that a scribe, finding two separate readings, combined the two, or finding the two combined, selected one? Evidence seems to point to the former, as the ancient scribe invariably wished to keep every word of the sacred truth. Here comes in the evidence of the Fathers. When Chrysostom—Bishop of Antioch in Syria at the end of the fourth century—quotes, he quotes from these combined readings. Other writers about Antioch at that time also take these readings, and are in fact the first to use them. Hence this type of text, which is the text of the later uncials and cursives, the 'traditional text' of Burgon, the text that generally underlies our Authorized Version, has been described by Dr. Hort as the

'Syrian' text, a text later than the other two, and the result of a revision in or about Antioch in the third century. This gives us our first group. A second and smaller group is the 'Western,' which is found mainly in Latin MSS., the Curetonian Syriac, and in those like Codex Bezæ, which have both Greek and Latin texts. The third group is still smaller, and this they subdivide into two—the 'Alexandrian,' a type most often quoted by the Alexandrian Fathers, and found as detached readings in a few MSS.; and the 'neutral,'—so called because no restricted locality can claim it,—found in the two oldest MSS. we possess, B and ℵ, with the support of a very limited number of uncials and cursives, and many readings in authorities which elsewhere diverge into Western and Alexandrian forms of variation. This 'neutral' type is the one which Hort thinks represents most nearly the original text of the New Testament. The chief evidence for the theory is that of the Fathers, as Hort points out. He asserts that no purely Syrian reading is found in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and if this can be disproved, his theory breaks down. Immediately upon the publication of this *Introduction*, came fierce denunciations of the work by Dean Burgon in the *Quarterly*, and in his book, *The Revision Revised*. Burgon was all the more furious because it was Westcott and Hort's Greek text that was taken as the foundation for the R.V. He hit on Hort's weak point, the 'Syrian Revision,' and called for a proof. But admitting the Revision, Burgon asserted that if the Fathers had held a council, when condemning all 'Western' readings, they would have altogether rejected the MSS. ℵ B and D, if they were before them. 'They must have had before them many codices like B and ℵ, and such will have omitted such passages as the last twelve verses in Mark. But these MSS. were rejected, and such passages were admitted as Scripture. Yet Dr. Hort says they were early interpolations.' He thinks Hort's efforts result not in the recovery of the text, but only in an able restoration of the Eusebian Recension. But when he says that Westcott and Hort's text shows that the science of textual criticism has been only imperfectly apprehended, calls their theory a pyramid balanced on its apex, resulting in the most extravagant text which has seen the light since the invention of printing, and designates the R.V. a first-rate schoolboy's crib—tasteless, unlovely, harsh, unidiomatic; servile without being really faithful; pedantic without being really learned; an unreadable translation, in short; we feel, to use an Americanism, we can have no further use for Dean Burgon as a critic. He asserted the MSS. B and ℵ were preserved solely by their ascertained evil character, which occasioned the one to go to a forgotten shelf in the Vatican, and the other to the waste-basket. He thought the text was preserved because it was inspired, and claimed that all down the ages the sacred writings 'must needs have been' God's peculiar care. Dr. Hort, on the other hand, did not lay down what 'must needs have been' the course of events, but tried to discern what that course had been. He examined into the question of the transmission of ancient literature in general by manuscripts, and only when he had thus obtained his rules did he apply them to the Scriptures.

Burgon, always in opposition to the prevailing current of his own age, died before he could get all his materials together in a formal treatise. Like all men of his calibre, he only prejudiced against him the very people he wished to gain, by the violence and intemperance of his language. His work has been gathered together, and lately published by Edward Miller, M.A., in *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*, who asserts that the scientific criticism of the last fifty years has been wholly mistaken. Briefly, Miller and Burgon hold—(1) the predominance of the traditional text (which is Dr. Hort's Syrian Revision), from the fourth century to the nineteenth, is itself a proof of its superiority, since it rests on the authority of the Catholic Church; (2) in point of fact the traditional text can be shown to have been also predominant even before the fourth century; (3) the traditional text, as embodied in the later uncials and the cursives, is intrinsically superior to that contained in the earlier uncials. Of these propositions, the second and third would be simply denied by Dr. Hort's followers, the first declared irrelevant and misleading.

Professor Warfield, in his *Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, is to Westcott and Hort what Hammond is to Scrivener. It is professedly a primary guide to students making their first acquaintance with the art of Textual Criticism as applied to the New Testament. It is the best possible primer for the purpose. Every student

would do well to begin with it. It is simple and easy to understand, and the student who has read this will be well equipped for Westcott and Hort's *Introduction*, which is very difficult. Warfield is particularly helpful in giving some hint as to the meaning of the compressions used in speaking of the ancient authorities. These, as a rule, the beginner in Textual Criticism finds perplexing. All the writers use them, and all assume knowledge of their meaning from the reader. But none say where they are to be found, or attempt to explain them. As Tischendorf's great work is not the first book a student uses, it may be some time before he finds the key. It is left to Warfield to tell us that all these signs and their meanings are given in a list in Tischendorf's *Introduction*, and these he clearly explains and illustrates. Warfield, further, shows the limits of the goodness of versions, and treats fully of the 'matter' and 'methods of criticism,' using and explaining the terms of Westcott and Hort, and setting forth their conclusions briefly and simply. He is especially good in showing how to apply the methods of criticism (the 'praxis of criticism') by examples taken from certain selected passages. He explains these at length, and holds to Hort throughout.

Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, by Dr. Kenyon, is also based in thought on Westcott and Hort. It includes both the Old and New Testaments, and gives excellent reduced facsimiles of the old manuscripts. His object is to condense in a moderate volume the principal results at which the specialists had arrived, and to give the reader a general knowledge of the textual history of the Bible. It may be used by students unacquainted with Hebrew and Greek, and is just what they need on account of the references made to the Queen's Printers' Variorum Bible. It is not so full of detail as the standard Introductions, but is fuller than most manuals, and is probably the best book published at the price where the student can obtain the same amount of trustworthy information. Kenyon explains why there should be variations in the text, and describes the Hebrew text, and how and in what condition it has come down to us. So also in the New Testament he gives the history of the text, describes the manuscripts, and brings it down through the printed Bibles to the R.V., on which he has a good chapter. He only ends with the year in which the volume was written—1896. Dr. Hort's theory is briefly sketched and defended, although the difficulty—a very real one—in the theory is admitted, viz. that there is absolutely no historical confirmation of the Syrian Revision, which is its corner-stone. Finally, Kenyon points out that most of the leading scholars of the day have given in their allegiance to Dr. Hort's theory, and, as he expresses it, 'the best hope for progress in textual criticism appears to lie along the track that has been opened out by the genius and learning of Dr. Hort.'

Dr. Salmon, in *Some Criticism of the Text of the New Testament*, frankly states his object, which is to point out to some future investigator the weak points in Westcott and Hort. He rebels against the 'servility' with which their history has been accepted, and their text taken as final. He thinks Hort has favourites in MSS., and shows exaggeration in judgment. Finally, he asks for a new trial by experts, and pleads for a suspension of judgment. He states clearly the points of difference between Westcott-Hort and Burgon, and himself differs from both, for Burgon and Miller exaggerated the ecclesiastical aspect of the question, and Westcott and Hort did not attach sufficient value to the sanction given to a text by Church use. Salmon objects to their treatment of the 'Western' text, *i.e.* to their pouring contumely on D and Western MSS. generally, and thinks the last word has not been said on New Testament criticism until the question of the origin of Western readings has received more attention than Westcott and Hort have been disposed to give it. He asserts that the whole tone of their *Introduction* is that of teachers instructing disciples. A great objection is their question-begging nomenclature, in particular their using the term 'neutral' for one of their groups, instead of the old term 'Alexandrian.' The name presupposes their theory, that all alteration of this neutral text is due to later corruptions, and disguises the fact that the question what text has the most early attestation cannot be decisively answered. 'I consider that it is not scientific to stereotype a theory by a nomenclature until the theory has been established beyond reach of controversy. If Westcott and Hort have said the last word about New Testament criticism, we shall do well to adopt their nomenclature; but if it is to be open to us to examine the foundations of their theory, the first step to progress must be the abandonment of the fettering names, in particular the word "neutral."' What Westcott and Hort have

restored, in Salmon's opinion, is not the autograph, but an Alexandrian text of the second and third centuries. He alleges as a serious fault in their work that neither of them appears to have taken any interest in the Synoptic question,—in inquiries whether the Synoptic Gospels have any common basis, oral or written,—and thinks our decision on the point must affect our decision on Textual Criticism. Salmon favours the theory of Dr. Blass, that there were two editions made of the Acts by Luke himself, but doubts it of the Gospel. As to the latter, Dr. Salmon offers a suggestion of his own: that Luke may have continued to reside at Rome after the expiration of Paul's two years, and may there have given readings of his work; explanations of different points would be preserved in the West, and thus would arise the 'Western' variations in Luke between the reports given by two different hearers of a story orally delivered in the presence of both. Salmon, like Kenyon, inclines to believe that the formal revision of the sacred text in or about Antioch may probably be a myth, and that the traditional text was the result rather of a process continued over a considerable period of time, than of a set revision by constituted authorities. Both here and in Kenyon are very excellent analyses or 'contents' of the chapters.

For the 'Western' text the chief authority is the Codex Bezæ, generally spoken of as Codex D. This is a sixth century Græco-Latin MS. of the Gospels and the Acts,—the Greek and Latin texts being in parallel columns,—and hailing from Southern Gaul. The question on which the critics are at issue is: What relation, if any, does the Greek text, which appears on the left-hand page, bear to the Latin version, which appears on the right? Also whether the answer applies to Codex D alone, or to the Western text generally? Dr. Scrivener held that the Latin was derived from the Greek, but Dr. Hort thought they were derived independently from earlier Greek and Latin archetypes. Now the Bezan text of the Acts, unlike that of other MSS., exhibits expanded texts, which are thought to be the interpolations or glosses of some scribe. A few examples (the expansions being in italics) are—

12[23] (*And when he came down from the judgment seat*) he was eaten of worms (*while yet living, and even thus*) gave up the ghost.

16[35] But when it was day, the magistrates (*gathered together in the forum; and remembering the earthquake which had taken place*) sent the sergeant, saying . . . .

15[32] Judas and Silas being themselves also prophets (*full of the Holy Spirit*).

It is asked, Are these glosses; or does the Codex D represent the original text of the Acts? Dr. Blass has given forth the latest view in his *Ein alte Recension der Apostelgeschichte* of 1894, and his *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucæ ad Theophilum liber alter* of 1895. He suggests that the Bezan text and the Receptus represent nothing less than two successive editions of the Acts, put forth by Luke himself: that the longer text represents the inspired writer's first draft of his work, while the shorter reproduces, with more or less exact fidelity, the fair copy which Luke sent to Theophilus. For the glosses, he thinks, while making the narrative more graphic, yet add nothing to our knowledge; and are such as no unauthorized person would have thought it worth while to insert. Also there was a special reason why Luke should make two copies: his book alone is distinguished by being addressed to a person of high rank. Now, such a book would be neatly written on choice parchment, and would almost certainly be preceded by a rough copy, which the writer would keep, and which, after his death, would be highly prized by the Church. And the second copy would be distinguished from the first by greater conciseness. Blass, however, leaves out of count the singularly ungrammatical construction of not a few of the glosses alleged against the Codex Bezæ. Besides Blass,—Harris, Chase, and Ramsay have put forward hypotheses of their own. Professor Rendel Harris, in his *Study of the Codex Bezæ*, tries to prove that the Greek text has been revised and adapted to the Latin version. 'So this Latinised Greek text can have no certain value, except where it differs from its own Latin.' He thinks that in the bilingual MSS. the Greek was freely corrected to conform to the Latin, which was a primitive translation of the Gospels and Acts, made at Rome, Lyons, or Carthage in the second century, from a text already marked by a few Western readings, and afterwards corrupted by Montanist glosses. He claims to show that the Western text, not only in D, but also as represented in some of the earlier versions, has largely Latinized; to this source is due its peculiarities.

Professor Wilkins, in articles in the *Expositor* (November and December 1894), characterizes Dr. Harris' theory as attractive, but not more than a possible hypothesis, and the foundations for it but weak and scanty. He shows, by an examination of Harris' instances, that it is not safe to say more than that the Greek and Latin agree in a looseness of expression which may have originated with either. 'Though there may be unmistakable traces that at some stage in the history of the tradition the Greek text was here and there adapted to the Latin, there is no evidence whatever to show that this was done either systematically or completely.' Harris' statement that the Bezan Greek owes the greater part of its textual and grammatical peculiarities to the reflex action of its own Latin, seems to Dr. Wilkins to have been inadequately supported. Further, he thinks it is surely possible to believe that one or two codices are interpolated, without holding that this correction ever extended to the Western text generally. To say that the primitive Western bilingual was Marcionised, is to go beyond the evidence.

There was next published Dr. Chase's *The Syriac Element in Codex Bezæ*, in which is set forth yet another hypothesis, viz. that the peculiarities of the Codex are due to retranslation into the Greek from an old Syriac version. Dr. Chase began his work because he thought Harris' methods were unsatisfactory, and his main conclusions untenable. By a close examination of the earlier chapters of the Acts, he infers that the Bezan text existed as early as 180 A.D., and the implied Old Syriac text which lies behind it existed about the middle of the second century. His conclusion is that Codex D and the Western text originated at Antioch, and this would account for the survival of rare Western readings in the works of Chrysostom. They would naturally linger in Antioch, the place of their birth. The Latin version was also made there. Chase thinks the Bezan interpolations or glosses are from a document written in some other language: and as the glosses bear traces of a Syriac idiom, it is presumed they were derived from the Syriac. The case is strengthened by the fact that the actual Syriac Vulgate, the Peshito, still retains traces of expressions which might well have given birth to some at least of the Bezan readings. Finally, if the Bezan glosses are derived from a Syriac origin, it leads to a conclusion of importance, viz. the place and date of the Old Latin version of the New Testament. Thus the date of the Old Syriac version would be 170 A.D., and that of the Old Latin 170–190 A.D.

In reply to Chase, Professor Rendel Harris published his *Four Lectures on the Western Text.* In this he examines: (1) the theory of Resch and Credner that D has a Judæo-Christian origin, and that the Latin text was added afterwards to the Greek; (2) Dr. Blass' theory that it is an original document in good Lucan Greek; and (3) Dr. Chase's theory that the Codex is under Old Syriac influence. First, he justifies Chase's hypothesis, and removes it into the region of fact, by proving the existence of an Old Syriac text of the Acts. He was enabled to do this by the fresh evidence which had been afforded in Conybeare's translation of an Armenian work on the Acts,—probably a translation from the Syriac,—which contains a large number of extracts from Ephrem's lost Commentary on Acts. These fragments exhibit an expanded or unabridged Old Syriac text of the Acts very like the text of Codex D. But Dr. Harris goes no further with Dr. Chase, for he questions Chase's further contention that this hypothesis is an adequate one to explain the peculiarities of the Western text in general, and of the Bezan Acts in particular. He denies the Syriac origin of the Bezan glosses.

Professor Ramsay, in *The Church in the Roman Empire*, also touches on this point. In his remarkable chapter viii., on the Codex Bezæ, he attributes many changes of the text to the hand of a Greek reviser acquainted with the geography of Asia Minor. He claims, further, to have made it clear that on European soil the supposed reviser is by no means at home, but blunders rather badly in his efforts to improve the text. What is a strong argument against Blass' theory is where a positive error seems to be involved, as in the passage *de Philippi*, and in 17^{15}, 'and he passed by Thessaly,' etc.; for, as Ramsay points out, the reviser seems to have mistaken a sea voyage for a journey by land. If one such error in fact in the Bezan glosses can be established, it must throw suspicion upon them all. They cannot have originated from Luke himself, but must be mere unauthorized interpolations. Ramsay thinks the Bezan text is founded on a Catholic recension, certain features in the narrative which are characteristic of the social system of Asia Minor, but which were distasteful

to the Church at large, having been eliminated, *e.g.* the prominence of women in $17^{12\ 34}$. Then follows argument to prove from the reviser's use of certain politico-geographical terms that he belonged to the second century. That the revision can hardly be dated later than 150–160 A.D. is the final conclusion.

Over the problems in the Acts many textual critics have spent time. One of the latest contributions is Dr. M'Giffert's *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, in which he tries to show that the Acts could not have been written by Luke, the friend of St. Paul. He thinks the author was not an eye-witness, but wrote some time later, and was dependent on 'Sources' for his information. He allows that Luke sometimes showed real literary skill and the instinct of a true historian, so he does not take the extreme form of the Source theory. The Source-theory proper practically ignores the author, and gives him little credit for skill or veracity: it is merely a question of scissors and paste, and all depends on the sources used—whether early and trustworthy, or late and bad. A good deal turns on the 'We sections,' as they are called: many think these were the genuine work of a companion of St. Paul, incorporated by a later writer—the author of Acts. But, as Ramsay asks: 'Who is this author who sometimes transfers to his pages fragments of a "Source" more awkwardly than the feeblest Byzantine compiler, for he forgets to change a first person to a third; at another time selects and remodels till he has constructed a narrative which shows the instinct of a true historian?' Ramsay, in his *St. Paul the Traveller*, and in a paper in the *Expositor* for January last, holds that a great part of the Acts is not dependent on written sources; that it was gathered from the lips of the actors themselves, and especially that some of it (the 'We sections') was written down by the author, Luke, from personal knowledge. For much of the remainder he was indebted to the narrative of St. Paul. But Ramsay is ready to allow that there are signs of other sources in the book, and some of them may even have been written.

In the above book, and in *The Church in the Roman Empire*, Ramsay brought forward his 'South Galatian theory,' viz. that the Galatian district mentioned in the founding of the Galatian Churches in Acts 16^{6} 18^{23} denoted the Roman province which bore that name, and not the district popularly and generally known as Galatia. In the *Expositor*, 1893 and 1894, there is a controversy between Chase and Ramsay on this point: 'The Galatia of the Acts.' This is well summed up by Gifford (in the July number, 1894), who inclines to Ramsay's view, and thinks it quite inexplicable that there should be absolute silence on Luke's part on so important a branch of St. Paul's apostolic work as the foundation of the Galatian churches as there would be according to the 'North Galatian theory.' The question turns a good deal on grammar.

An interesting article on 'The Twelve Verses of Mark' appeared in the *Expositor* of 1893, by Mr. Conybeare, in which he brings forward the theory that they were written by Aristion, the master of Papias. Conybeare recently collated an ancient Armenian Codex of the Gospels in the Mount Ararat Library. The Gospel of Mark is copied out in this Codex as far as ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. Then a space of two lines is left, after which, in the same uncial hand, only in red, is written 'Ariston Eritzou,' which means, 'of the Presbyter Ariston,' and is probably an Armenian misspelling of the Greek Aristion. The writer must have been as important almost as Mark himself, judging from the prominence given to his name, and the red uncials in which it is written. Aristion may have written a narrative of the works and words of Jesus, and this may have been added by some editor because of the abrupt ending of our Mark. The name of Aristion would be omitted by certain New Testament scribes because there were only four evangelists. As Conybeare says, we know that Aristion was a disciple of the Lord, a pupil or companion of the apostles, and either wrote or delivered orally the words of the Lord, and Papias wrote these down in his Logia, often mentioning Aristion by name as the source of his information. This is seen in Eusebius' *History*, book iii. ch. 39.

Some interesting articles bearing on Textual Criticism are to be found in the four volumes of the *Studia Biblica*. In volume i., Professor Wordsworth, in 'The Corbey St. James and its Relation to other Latin Versions,' shows its bearing on the question of the language in which St. James originally wrote. It makes extremely probable the hypothesis of a Hebrew or Aramaic original, from which were formed two independent Greek versions. This is important, because it would remove the difficulty as to the authenticity of the

Epistle as we have it, which otherwise might arise from the highly classical, elaborate vocabulary, which yet is Jewish in spirit. We have also a short paper by Professor Sanday on the newly discovered Codex Romanensis, imperfectly collated in 1882, and not allowed to be seen since; and a technical treatise by Mr. Gwilliam, attempting to settle what was the text current as the vernacular version in the early Syrian Church from collations he has recently made of the Peshito MSS. in the British Museum.

Volume ii. contains a most interesting discussion by Mr. H. J. White on the 'Birthplace of the Codex Amiatinus.' This, one of the largest biblical MSS. in existence, is now proved to have been written at the order of Ceolfrid, Abbot at Wearmouth, and sent as a gift to Pope Gregory II., in the beginning of the eighth century. Thus it brings us into contact with the Venerable Bede, and shows how large and flourishing a school of caligraphy there was at Wearmouth or Jarrow at that early date.

Mr. White's article, also in this volume, on 'The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels,' which proves the priority of St. Mark by the order of events which is followed, gives valuable help.

The textual points in the Epistles and Gospels are usually dealt with in their respective commentaries, but we note especially Dr. Hort's *Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians*. This should certainly be studied: it deals most fully with all the textual difficulties found in these two Epistles. The various Introductions we do not mention, as these only touch occasionally on textual matters.

A most important recent publication is *Philology of the Gospels*, by Professor Blass: a treatise on the textual condition and criticism of the Gospels. Dr. Blass endeavours to prove that St. Luke wrote two copies of his Gospel, as he has previously endeavoured to prove the double texts of the Acts. He further proceeds to discuss the origin of various readings, and he traces back some of the variants in the Gospels to sources and to a time which cannot be reached by documentary evidence. He is inclined to advocate the freer use of conjectural emendation, and gives several rather startling instances of such. The second chapter, in which he examines philologically the separate words of Luke's Introduction, is particularly valuable.

More recently Dr. Blass has published his *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. In this the illustrations used are taken from the MSS. themselves and not from the editions. It is distinct from Winer's *Grammar* in its greater abundance of classical illustration. But the price—14s. net, for 340 pages—will be rather prohibitive: especially as it is not half the size of Winer's work. Some important books are Deissmann's *Bibelstudien* (1895) and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897), for they prove, from the collections of inscriptions and papyrus records published at Berlin in 1895, that the Greek of the New Testament is just the vernacular of the day. Several so-called Hebraisms in the New Testament are found with the same meaning in the inscriptions mentioned.

Lately, several new texts of the New Testament have been issued; among them, Baljon's *Greek Testament*. The first volume contains the four Gospels. The texts of Tischendorf, as also that of Westcott-Hort, does not satisfy him, hence he has constructed a text for himself. Most important is, that he gives the authorities for the various readings with great fulness.

In Rev. H. J. White's *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. IV., we are enabled to see the relation between the Old Latin Texts and the Vulgate, from the citations given by the Bobbio Palimpsest.

The Greek Testament of the Bible Society of Stuttgart—new edition, edited by Professor Nestle—not only gives on the margin the differences between Westcott-Hort and Tischendorf, but also at the foot of the pages gives some manuscript readings, mainly from the Codex Bezæ, and not found in the above editions. Nestle agrees with Blass in assigning to this manuscript much more value than Westcott-Hort are inclined to do. But this—the value to be attributed to the Western text—is the great crux of the present day. It has yet to be determined.

The Temptation of Christ.

By the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, B.A., B.D., Montrose.

I.

Although the temptation of Christ is one of the Christian facts into which Christian thought with a mistaken awe does not care to search earnestly, yet it is a fact which offers us many questions, the answers to which help us greatly to understand the being and the work of Christ. To some of these questions answers will, in what follows, be attempted.

I. The first of the questions which meet us is the value and the source of the records. Is Mark's brief report to be preferred to the longer accounts of Matthew and Luke? If the longer accounts are accepted, are we to follow Matthew's order of the temptations, or Luke's? Whichever of the records we may prefer, we must further ask ourselves, Whence and how did the evangelists get their reports?

1. Is Mark to be preferred to Matthew and Luke, or are the longer to be chosen rather than the brief account? On this question opinions are divided. Holtzmann maintains Mark's originality, while Keim as emphatically asserts his dependence. The former declares that 'the truly historical situation can be detected only in Mark i. 12, 13, where no pictorial representation has yet taken place, and where the sole purpose is to allow Him who was inwardly decided for the Messiahship to endure a first decisive test' (*Handkommentar*, i. p. 68). The latter says of the narrative of the temptation in Mark, that it 'is but the barren, and in itself obscure and unserviceable outline of the dramatic narrative of Luke, only somewhat strengthened by the addition of the wild beasts, an addition which again is itself obscure' (*Jesus of Nazara*, English translation, i. p. 135). This difference of estimate results from opposed solutions of the Synoptic problem, into which it is impossible now to enter; only a few words can be given to dealing with this narrower question. It must be acknowledged that it is not easy to understand how or why Mark chose to give so general an account of this event, if the detailed reports of the temptation were current in apostolic circles. His Gospel is marked by vivid, graphic description, to which this record is an exception. Assuming the traditional account of the origin of his Gospel as representing the preaching of Peter, it seems very unlikely that Peter would be ignorant of the detailed report, and knowing it, would be content to communicate to others this bare outline. But, on the other hand, it is an assumption which destroys the credibility of the other evangelists as historians, that they can have been capable of so free and daring an expansion of their traditional material as must have taken place, if Mark's is regarded as the original report. Even if this expansion be carried back to their literary sources, the same doubt of the trustworthiness of the story told in the Gospels must assert itself. It is further to be noted that the explanation usually given of the literary composition of the longer records is artificial and arbitrary, and assumes an ingenuity and a subtlety of thought in the writers that do not appear at all probable. Lastly, here there seems to be no reason why the shorter account should be preserved by tradition. It is too indefinite and obscure to serve any didactic purpose, whereas the longer reports do offer lessons interesting and important for Christian faith. It must be frankly acknowledged that, whatever view we take, there remain questions unanswered; but it seems to me that there is less difficulty in choosing the longer records rather than the brief account.

2. But as soon as we turn to these longer records, another question meets us. Are we to prefer Matthew's or Luke's order of the temptations? Matthew's order is usually taken to be right. It is generally argued that Matthew's Gospel is nearer the original sources than Luke's, even if Farrar's statement, that 'as an actual apostle he is more likely to have heard the narrative from the lips of Christ Himself,' cannot be unhesitatingly accepted. It is also generally agreed that Luke exercises much greater editorial liberty in dealing with his sources; and here reasons for the change of order can be suggested. Holtzmann suggests that the answer of Jesus in

the second temptation (according to Matthew's order), 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God,' appeared to Luke a fitting close to the temptations, as it appeared to forbid any further attempts on the part of the tempter; and that 'geographical reflexions may have co-operated in commending the change in the order of scenes'—first, the desert, then the mountain, and, lastly, the city. Farrar says that Luke 'adopts a different order of the temptations, perhaps because he thought that the temptation to spiritual pride was keener and subtler than that to temporal ambition; perhaps, too, because he believed that the ministering angels (whom, however, he does not mention) only appeared to save Christ from the pinnacle of the temple' (Farrar's *Luke*, p. 144). Although the reasons for the change suggested may not all equally commend themselves to one's judgment, yet there is a strong presumption in favour of Matthew's order of events.

3. Having preferred Matthew's and Luke's longer records to Mark's brief account, and having decided in favour of the order of temptations given by Matthew, we now reach the third stage in our inquiry. Whence did the evangelists get their reports? Two answers present themselves for our choice. The narratives are literary compositions of the evangelists themselves, or of their literary sources, under the guidance of theological considerations, Old Testament analogies, and actual occurrences in the life of Jesus; or the account of the temptations was communicated to His followers by Jesus Himself.

(*a*) The first view has already been touched on in answering the first question regarding the originality or dependence of Mark; but it needs to be more fully treated now, although we have hitherto gone on the assumption that what we have before us in the narratives is not fiction, but history. Holtzmann's account of the formation of these narratives may be taken fairly as one of the best of these attempts. The starting-point of the formation is the theological assumption that Jesus, who cast out demons, must Himself in personal conflict have overcome the devil, and maintained His Messiahship against all assaults and suggestions of the tempter. The history of Israel, God's 'first-born son' in the wilderness, suggested the forms taken by the temptations. Israel, when hungering, murmured against God in unbelief; demanded a display of the divine power; and fell before the temptation to idolatry and apostasy. The true Son of God must be shown victorious over the same temptations as overcame the people. The passages quoted by Jesus from Deuteronomy indicate the connexion of the evangelical narrative and the Old Testament history. But the events of Jesus' ministry also helped to give shape to the story of the temptations. He would not feed the crowds again, when they came to Him after the feeding of the five thousand; He would not give a sign from Heaven to prove His claims; He would not set up an earthly kingdom, although urged thereto by the wishes of His followers, as well as the hopes of the people. This account is ingenious and subtle; but is such an artificial formation of the narratives more probable or more credible than the assumption that Jesus was Himself thus tempted? What follows will, I trust, show that we are not forced to accept any such literary composition on the part of the evangelists.

(*b*) If we assume that Jesus was thus tempted, it is clear, that as there were no eye-witnesses in the wilderness, we must owe the reports of the evangelists to Jesus Himself.

Requests and Replies.

I have read with interest, in the February number of *The Expository Times*, Professor Hommel's article on the newly published list of early Babylonian kings, and his vindication of the biblical chronology which he connects with it. I am at a loss, however, how to reconcile his view with a statement of Professor Sayce's in *The Expository Times* for January, p. 172. According to Professor Hommel, the Pharaoh of the Exodus was Amenophis II. (*c.* 1461-1436 B.C.); according to Professor Sayce, the question 'has been set at rest by Dr. Naville's excavations on the site of Pithom,' that Ramses II. (1324-1258 B.C.) was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, which would make his successor, Merenptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Thus in the date which they assign to the Exodus, these two authorities differ by just two centuries; and a question which one affirms to have been 'set at rest' by the progress of archæology, is by the other declared to be still perfectly open. Can any of your readers tell me how I may reconcile these apparently contradictory opinions?—INQUIRER.

'INQUIRER'S' question is indirectly answered by Professor Hommel on p. 278 of the March number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. He now lays more stress on the general scheme of O.T. chronology than on statements of detail like that in Ex 1^{11}. I, on the other hand, believe that the time for settling the chronological question has not yet arrived, and that the author of Ex 1^{11} had good historical grounds for what he says. We are there told that Pithom and Ramses were built by the Israelites for the Pharaoh of the Oppression. Egyptologists have long ago shown that a town of Ramses could not have been founded before the rise of the nineteenth dynasty, and the excavations of Dr. Naville at Tel el-Maskhuta have proved that Pithom was built by Ramses II. Ramses II., accordingly, must have been the Pharaoh of the Oppression. A. H. SAYCE.

Luxor.

What does Christ mean by the *mansions* of which He speaks in John xiv. 2?—A.S.T.

THE word translated here 'mansion' (μονή) signifies no more than 'abode.' It comes from μένω, to abide. Its only other occurrence in the N.T. is in v.[23], 'If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' If there is any special meaning in it, the context must bring it out, the word itself is found nowhere else in any other sense than the general one of dwelling-place, abode.

It is commonly understood that 'the Father's house' of Jn 14^2 is heaven, and the many mansions are separate dwelling-places in heaven suited to each believer. That, however, introduces a strange, if not inconceivable, notion of heaven, and there are some, like Westcott, who understand that 'mansion' means 'stage,' and that the reference is to stages of progress to be made in heaven. But there is nothing in the etymology or use of the word to suggest that meaning, and it seems incongruous with the context.

Suppose that the Father's house covers more than heaven as we usually understand it. Suppose that it expresses the whole wide universe, as it easily may. Then the mansions in it are found wherever the Father's presence is consciously felt. Wherever one loves the Lord, there the Father and the Son come and make a mansion. Jesus does not say that He is about to leave one mansion and go to another. He merely says that in the Father's house there are many mansions. And it is entirely in accordance with St. John's style to let that sentence stand by itself. Then He adds, 'I go to prepare a place for you.'

Now this word 'place' does not stand simply as a synonym for mansion. It is usually read as if it were, 'In My Father's house are many mansions, and I go to prepare one of them for you.' But the word 'place' has a technical meaning (as Mr. Buchanan Gray recently showed in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* in another connexion). It signifies a place that one has a right to, a residence of one's own. So when Jesus said, 'I go to prepare a place for you,' He meant I go by the way of the Cross, and the Cross will give you access to God, a residence in the Father's house, out of which no one can drive you. In the world as it is you have no place to call your own. But I go to prepare a place for you, and then the Father and I will come and make our loved mansion, our home with you.

Thus the first necessity is a place,—right of access to the Father, the standing of the righteous in the Father's sight. The next is a mansion,—

conscious enjoyment of the Father's presence. The one is gained through the Son, the other in the Son. The one is by the Son's going away, the other by His coming back. The disciples are not to be troubled, therefore, that Jesus has to go away. It may look like breaking up their mansion —the only mansion they know or care to know. But there are many mansions. This is not really a mansion at all. The mansion cannot be till the place has been first secured. When the place has been secured, He will come again and receive them unto Himself, making His mansion with them.

That is a suggestion: the passage is very difficult.

The word 'mansion' comes from the Vulgate. It is the same as the word 'manse.' Both are formed from *maneo*, to stay.

EDITOR.

The Undeciphered Hittite Inscriptions.

IN REPLY TO PROFESSOR SAYCE.

BY PROFESSOR P. JENSEN, PH.D., MARBURG.

IN a recent issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (December 1898, p. 115 f.), Professor Sayce published a short article on 'New Cuneiform Inscriptions,' which appears to me to fail of correctness in not a few essential points. Above all, I must enter my protest against the last line on p. 115, where he speaks of the 'still undeciphered Hittite texts,' and the concluding sentence of the article (p. 116), in which he expresses the opinion that through the new cuneiform fragments discovered in Cappadocia, written in a dialect perhaps partially non-Assyrian,—dating, as it seems, from the time of Sargon, king of Assyria, or later,—'the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions has at last been brought within measurable distance.'

The words quoted are, on the one hand, very gratifying, containing as they do an open confession by Professor Sayce that his own attempts at deciphering the inscriptions have been fruitless. And yet up to a few years ago he considered himself as their decipherer, and was regarded in that light by not a few! As far as I know, the appearance of my first paper on the Hittite monuments marks the point of time since which Professor Sayce has offered no further remarks on the interpretation of these, and so I suppose I have the credit of having led him to acknowledge his mistake. This, too, is very gratifying.

Less gratifying, however, at least to me, is the circumstance that Professor Sayce has not pursued further the path of confession,—an unpleasant one to be sure,—and at least tried to bring himself to confess that another has been more successful than himself. Since for a long time doubt on this point has been no longer possible, I would enter a protest on behalf of this other against Professor Sayce, and take this opportunity to put the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES in possession of the facts of the case.

Six years ago the present writer began to familiarize himself with the so-called Hittite inscriptions. In essential distinction from former attempts at decipherment, he first of all pursued the toilsome course of analysing the inscriptions, thus acting on the principle that only the Hittite inscriptions and sculptures themselves, and only the most painstaking and minute comparison of the whole of them with one another, could lay the foundation for their interpretation. This method was not fruitless. First of all he succeeded in determining their system of writing, which in its main features follows the model of the Egyptian. But in this way he was able also to recognize the main subject of almost all the inscriptions. He could perceive that they recorded nothing very wonderful, but were rather made up, at least in the main, of titles and attributes with all kinds of variations. He discovered the expressions for a considerable number of kings' names. He perceived that the bearers of these used certain expressions to indicate themselves as kings of certain lands, others to designate themselves as servants or the like of certain divinities, and others still to mark themselves as the son of such and such a one.

He identified the symbols or groups of signs for 'land,' 'I,' 'am,' 'this,' as well as for a series of boastful adjectives, etc.

He discovered, further, that the kings of Hamāt and Karkemīsh in Syria, of Mar'ash in the north of it, of Bor and Bulgarmaden to the west of, or lying on the north-western declivity of, the Taurus, ruled over distinct kingdoms. He perceived, with approximate certainty, that the majority of the inscriptions, including those found in the localities above-named, emanated from a period between 1000 and 500 B.C., and that consequently the inscriptions refuse their support to those who, upon the ground of their diffusion over Syria and a great part of Asia Minor, conclude that at one time there was a great empire of the Hittites extending from the Lebanon to the Ægean Sea, about the year 1400 B.C. or later.

All the above conclusions, and more, could be deduced from the inscriptions without one's being able to read a single hieroglyph.

After the present writer had succeeded in determining what expressions stood for the dominions of the kings who figure in the inscriptions of Hamāt, of Jerabīs, of Mar'ash, of Bor, and of Bulgarmaden, and, further, what kind of names we must expect for these, he could go a step beyond, and *read* the groups of signs that stand for them. Thus he was able to read a group for Hamāt in an inscription of Hamāt, one for Karkemīsh in a series of inscriptions from Jerabīs, in the territory or on the site of the ancient Karkemīsh, and one in an inscription of a late king of Cilicia, who, according to the inscription of Bulgarmaden, ruled also over the district of Karkemīsh. He was able to read a group for Markash or Gurgum in an inscription of Mar'ash = the ancient Markash, the capital of Gurgum; and, finally, to read groups for Cilicia and Tarsus in inscriptions of kings who must have reigned over Cilicia, with its capital Tarsus. He succeeded, too, in the early stages of his attempts at decipherment, in reading another group, which was quite sufficient of itself to prove to any unprejudiced mind that he was following the right path. In the inscriptions of Ivrīz, Bulgarmaden, Bor, and Andaval, to the west of, or lying on the north-western declivity of, the Taurus, is to be found, and there only, a royal title, whose radical form consists of four signs, of which the first and the last are identical. This sign, on account of the extraordinary frequency of its occurrence, could represent only a simple sound. The inscriptions in question emanated from kings of Cilicia. But now we happen to know that the title of the later Cilician kings was Συεννεσι-ς, having *s* for its first and also its last consonant. Hence the above-named group of signs in the so-called Hittite inscriptions was to be read *Sy(u)ennesi-s*.

The test of the correctness of our readings and implicitly for that of all the deciphering results we had reached up to this point, had now to be sought by observing whether the same signs in these name-groups had the same or similar sounds corresponding to them in the names which we read for them. But this turned out to be quite the case. Thus, the *m* of Hamāt was expressed by the same sign as that of Karkemīsh; the second *k* of the latter by the same sign as the second of Khilik(i)ā (Cilicia); the first and the third *s* of Syennesi-s by the same sign as the sibilant in Tars-us, etc. The test had thus succeeded completely, and the proof was thereby given that the decipherment and reading of the inscriptions had been really inaugurated.

From the name-groups that had been read with certainty, I could thus identify the signs for *m*, for a sibilant, for *r*, for *t(a)r*, etc., and could thus to a small extent read even the appellatives in the inscriptions.

And now came a surprising discovery. It was the very same evening upon which I had succeeded in reading the group for *Syennesi-s*, and immediately thereafter in connection with it the group for Tars-us, which involved the identification of the sign for a sibilant, it was that same evening that the following conclusion was reached as a consequence of the immediately preceding one. This sign for the sibilant is also the sign for the consonant of the word for 'I.' The latter then must contain a sibilant. From a group standing for the genitive of Karkemīsh (and from the small bilingual of the so-called 'Tarkondemos') we had deduced the pronunciation of the sign for *mi* and *me*, and '(I) am' was written in the inscriptions with this sign. Now vowels need not be written in the inscriptions, and in modern Armenian 'I' is *es*, from an older *eso*, while 'I am' is *em*, from an older *emi* or *mi*. Hence, so it struck me all at once, the so-called Hittite must be allied to the modern Armenian; nay more, in view of the cir-

cumstance that 'one from the land of Hati' (and the 'Hittites' dwelt in part there) could be called in prehistoric Armenian *Hatio*, and that the modern national name of the Armenians, namely, *Hay*, may go back to *Hatio*—in view of this, the further conclusion already lay very near to hand, *that the so-called Hittites are the ancestors of the modern Armenians*.

What may be said in favour of this view I have brought forward in the same larger work referred to above (see *ZDMG*, xlviii. pp. 235–352 and pp. 429–485), where I gave the first detailed account of my deciphering. Besides the two above-named coincidences between so-called Hittite and Armenian, I was able to adduce a great variety of others which, in my opinion, afforded quite sufficient proof of the correctness of my hypothesis. Thus, for instance, the circumstance that the genitive in the inscriptions is formed only by vowel endings, or that there is an ending *-m*, as I now know for certain, for the genitive plural (now replaced in Armenian by *ts*, but once unquestionably found in that language), or that 'this' is expressed by *a-i-s*, or the like (in Armenian *ais*), 'great,' or the like, by *m-s* (in Armenian *mets*), and that a word for 'child' or 'son' begins with a sibilant, while the Armenian term is *zaw-ak*, etc. I could, further, lay stress upon the fact that the domain of the ancient Hittites partly corresponded to that of the modern Armenians; that the type of the latter is akin to that of the Hittites; that a series of Hittite kings bear animal names; and that the personal names of the ancient Armenians belong to a very considerable extent to this last category, etc.

I had the hope, then, that my Armenian hypothesis might be accepted, but the fullest confidence that at least my deciphering results would be adopted without reserve. This expectation was not realized. A single individual (Professor Reckendorf), undeterred by the toilsome nature of the task, took the trouble to go over and test my work, with the result that he pronounced my deciphering to have succeeded in the main, and the Armenianism of the inscriptions to be at least an unobjectionable hypothesis. Not a few others expressed a conviction, or an opinion based upon purely subjective grounds or upon common-sense, that I was right. But at the same time, there were not wanting those who, in an equally subjective fashion, denied all value to my work, and destroyed its influence through judgments at once inconsiderate and superficial in the highest degree. Amongst others, Professor Sayce (in the *Academy*) gave an account of my work. What I think of his criticism I would rather not say here, and I need to do so all the less because I have already replied to him in the *Academy*. He attempted, so far as I know, no answer, and I can well believe that a reply would have been no agreeable task to him.

The above treatment, then, had succeeded in killing the work for a time. But I was right all the same, and *because* I was right, of which this was the most striking proof, in the course of my continued studies of the problem I found myself always deviating more and more from my predecessors (Sayce included), who, after the first start, plunged into a *cul de sac*, from which there was no outlet for further progress. Always lighter grew the darkness, always more were difficulties solved, small and great alike, which had appeared insuperable, ever more clearly did the Armenianism of the inscriptions become manifest. Thus, about a year ago, I was able to publish a book, entitled *Hittiter und Armenier*, in which, upon the ground of my results, I could decline to offer formal proof of the correctness of my decipherings, for the results themselves were the proof. Nor was my book written for such a purpose. Its aim was rather simply to justify the conclusion that the Hittites as a matter of fact were the ancestors of the modern Armenians. The evidence for this was drawn from—

1. The discovery made, meanwhile, in the inscriptions, and, indeed, in a great number of these, of the native name of the Hittites, which, as I had already supposed, turned out to be *Hatio*, while that of the Armenians, namely, *Hay*, may go back to an earlier *Hatio*.

2. The language of the inscriptions, whose forms correspond to an ancient prehistoric form of Armenian, which can be recovered by attending to the laws of Armenian phonetics.

3. The personal names of the people of our inscriptions, which, altered in accordance with the same laws, are to be found again to a large extent amongst Armenian proper names.

4. The sound values of the hieroglyphs, which, in so far as their original form is yet recoverable and their reading assured, are identical, at least for the consonants, with older forms of Armenian

words or the beginnings of these, which express the ideas represented by the hieroglyphs.

5. Finally—although this was only a half proof—the mythology of the Hittites, which, in so far as it can be deduced from the inscriptions and sculptures, may very readily be identified with the relics that have survived of the pre-Parthian Armenian religion.

The inscriptions are deciphered, then, and the so-called Hittites are the ancestors of the modern Armenians. Of this my book furnishes evidence enough. Surely it is unknown to Professor Sayce, who is otherwise so well informed about recent literature and discoveries. Else without doubt he would not have kept from telling the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, that, in view of the material contained in that book, it is a strong step any longer simply to ignore my labours on the inscriptions and to brush aside the weight of their evidence by the bare assertion that the inscriptions are still undeciphered. But if, in spite of all this, Professor Sayce does know my book, I should like to ask him this question, What evidence would induce him to admit that the problem has been solved by me? And yet the claims which he formerly made on behalf of his own attempts at decipherment were certainly not high.

But one must be just, and admit that for Professor Sayce to concede that I am right and he wrong must be a very hard task. For my decipherment has a totally different aspect from the one abandoned by him. Of all his combinations there remain established only a few which anyone could make who was not completely blind, and a few which he made *by accident*, with the help of the small bilingual of 'Tarkondemos' = Shilkuashemi (?). Of his deeper-reaching speculations every one has turned out a failure, and on the two points regarding which at the close of his article he thinks he is on firm ground, he is certainly wrong. The 'yoke' is not, as he supposes, a sign for the nominative ending while it is to be pronounced *(e)s*, but a determinative for the nominative without any regard to its ending, and *s* is not a nominative ending. Nor is the 'gloved hand' (*i.e.* what Professor Sayce calls such) an expression for an accusative ending *-ni*, for this reason, to begin with,—I can give Professor Sayce the most positive assurance on this point,—that in the inscriptions there is no such thing as the 'gloved hand' at all. They certainly contain numerous instances of 'hand hieroglyphs,' of which one—probably that which Professor Sayce has in view, which at a later period coincides with a sign for *ar* or *or*—is used to express the syllable *ia* or *io*, and hence serves on the one hand as the sign for the ending of adjectives in *-io*, and on the other hand indicates the ending of genitives in *-io* (*-ia*) and *-oio*, from nominatives in *-i* (from *-is*) and *-o* (from *-os*).

Special prominence deserves, however, to be given to a certain class of hand hieroglyphs. Already in my first work I suggested that certain hand signs—which, however, partly in consequence of the faultiness of copies at my disposal, I treated in a mass—might be 'god hieroglyphs.' To this supposition I was led by the following considerations:—(1) These signs frequently have over and under them a certain sign of separation, which elsewhere is found in this fashion only in a single—and analogous—instance, and must thus point to something deserving of special prominence; (2) these signs are not names of countries or of kings, but yet to all appearance something to which the king stands in a certain relation; (3) one of these signs is found also in the epitaph of a private person in combination with the same word which indicates the relation of the king to it; (4) these signs can be detected in almost all well-preserved inscriptions; (5) the mention of gods in the inscriptions is a thing we might expect.

Farther than this I did not get in my first work, a circumstance for which the bad editing of the inscriptions was in no small measure responsible. It now happens that at Boghazkai we have a long train of gods, which is being met by a train of goddesses, with the lover of the great goddess amongst them, and before each individual divinity in these we have his or her name in Hittite hieroglyphs. What more natural than to examine these in detail, and to search among them for hand hieroglyphs, in order thereby to prove the correctness of my supposition? But the extant copies did not justify the latter; they furnished no instance of hand hieroglyphs. It was not until I had procured from Berlin casts of the hieroglyphs before the god at the head of the procession of gods and before the two goddesses as well as before the god who stands behind the first of the goddesses, that I immediately recognized that a clenched fist is inscribed before

the first goddess and another hand hieroglyph before the second. I had been right, then, and could now say more specifically that a clenched fist was the, or a, hieroglyph for the great goddess of the so-called Hittites.

This state of things I was able to take account of in my book. There I was able to signalize another hand hieroglyph, perhaps representing the father or the mother of the king of the gods, because the latter at Ivrīz seems to be called the son (*s-t-r*; *i.e.* Armenian *ustr*) of the deity designated by the sign in question. In the same book I could point to a hieroglyph for the king of the gods himself, which is used at Ivrīz to designate him. The surprising circumstance now disclosed itself that this sign, beyond that one occurrence—and perhaps one other elsewhere—does not appear to occur in the inscriptions. It was hardly a compensation for this that the king of the gods appears elsewhere, namely, at Gurun, east of the Taurus, and there upon a seal, indicated by a different sign, namely, the trident. For it seemed as if he were not mentioned, at least by name, in any of the inscriptions of Jerabīs, Marʿash, etc., although other gods, at times a whole series of them, are named there.

But now this puzzle also has solved itself in a surprisingly simple fashion. One has only to look at the later cursive form of the fist hieroglyph to see at once that the hieroglyph for the king of the gods at Ivrīz can be nothing else than the cursive form for the open hand, which now, to be sure, is found quite plainly, with all five fingers, in three inscriptions, two of them from Jerabīs and one from Marʿash (the Lion inscription), and there can be no doubt that a cursive form of the same is present in a number of other inscriptions. The king of the gods, then, appears, as was to be expected, in a long series of inscriptions.—Now observe, there is quite a number of hand hieroglyphs for divine names, with two, three, four, and five fingers visible, and with these in all possible (at times very unusual) positions. In ways altogether independent of one another, I have been led to see in the open hand the, or rather a, symbol of the father of the gods, and in the clenched fist the, or a, symbol of the mother of the gods, and so in the two hand hieroglyphs with the five fingers in a natural position, the pair of supreme divinities who at Boghazkai walk at the head of the two processions of gods. This is implicitly a proof of the correctness of my combinations.

But further still, the king bears as a high title or attribute a word whose ideogram (*i.e.* sign for the notion expressed by it) is an upright narrow triangle, with two intersecting strokes, one perpendicular and one horizontal, drawn through it. So we find it, after the originals, in Hamāt (!), Jerabīs (!), Marʿash, Bulgarmaden, Bor (!), so upon the pommel of the 'Tarkondemos.' With this alternate, as phonetic forms of writing it, a sign composed of three perpendicular parallel strokes, followed or not by the signs for *i* and *e*, or we may have two such signs, and the sign for the dental, followed or not by the same signs. That is to say, this attribute must have some such pronunciation as this: *T* sound + *i* or *e* + *i* or *e*, and since it certainly survives in the Armenian *tēr* = 'lord' (from *dei* + *aro* = 'man') as well as the Armenian *tikin* = 'mistress' (from *dei* + *ginā* = 'woman'), we may set it down specifically as *dei*. Now the ideogram for this attribute is found also at Fraktin (on the north-western declivity of the Taurus) as the symbol for an attribute of the king of the gods. But in two inscriptions from Jerabīs we find it written phonetically, with the three perpendicular parallel strokes and the above-mentioned sign for the dental, to express an attribute of the god represented by the open hand! My conclusion has thus been confirmed in the most satisfactory way.

Further, this king of the gods of the 'Hittites' was encountered by the Greeks in Asia Minor under the name *Sanda*. The king of the gods is also the weather-god, and one of his symbols is the trident, which represents the lightning. But in Armenian 'lightning' is called not only *shand*, *shant*, but also *shandi* or *shanti*, *i.e.* 'the Shandian.' Instead of *Sanda*, Eusebius gives the name in the form *Desanda*. Now *Sanda* was called by the Hittites *dei*, and from this earlier form, namely, *dei*, must have arisen, according to the laws of Armenian phonetics, *de*! There can be no doubt, then, that *Desanda* is to be broken up into this *de* (for *dei*) and *Sanda* (*Shandas*). Further, it will be impossible to deny that this *Desanda* of Eusebius is another witness in our favour.

Once more, wherever several gods are named, there appears the open hand or an equivalent in the first place—this in quite a series of inscriptions at Hamāt, Jerabīs, Marʿash, Ordasu near Malatiyeh,

Bulgarmaden, Bor,—and so in the same whole group of inscriptions the fist appears in the second place, following the open hand or its equivalent in the first, or at all events following it or its equivalent. Nay, in two inscriptions, one from Jerabîs and one from Ordasu, the divine names marked by these two signs depend upon a *single* substantive, which marks the relation of the king to them. And in an inscription of Jerabîs the one divinity is called 'male,' the other 'woman'! In the same inscription, as well as at Mar'ash, the king calls himself 'the young ox' of these very two divinities, and the king of the gods is worshipped under the form of a steer, and *Sanda's* wife is called the δάμαλις, *i.e.* 'young cow.' Surely no more proofs are needed to establish irrefutably that the open hand and the clenched fist really point to the pair of supreme divinities.

Yet there remains something much more striking and at the same time more important.

When I published my book, I was already aware that there was a god with the name or the attribute *papa* or *baba* or *wawa* (in these words *o* may also be read instead of *a*). I was aware that the 'king' calls himself his *s-t-r*, *i.e.* 'son,' and necessarily inferred that the king of the gods is meant thereby. Therefore already at that stage I read the word *papa* or *baba*, and saw in it a term of endearment used in the cultus for 'father.' And, inasmuch as the Armenians are supposed to be allied to the Phrygians, I could recall the fact that the Bithynian Zeus is called Παπα-ς, as well as recall the Armenian names, *Bab*, *Babik*, *Babots*, in which *Bab* corresponds to *Tēr* in the Armenian names *Tēr*, *Tirik*, *Tirots*, while *tēr* means 'lord,' and *dei* with the same or a similar meaning is an attribute of the 'Hittite' king of the gods. And now it is certain that *papa* or *baba* is precisely an attribute of the god marked by the open hand!

In the inscriptions there is a word written *mi* (or *mè*) + *o* (or *a*). It was in the very earliest stages of my deciphering that it occurred to me to identify this with the Armenian *mi* (= 'one'), which goes back to an earlier *mio*. But a circumstance that need not be mentioned here finally deterred me from adopting this identification, and I took it into my head to see in the word an adjective, meaning 'powerful,' 'great,' or the like, and the circumstance referred to above compelled me to read *emio* for *mio*—all to the harm of my deciphering and not to the advantage of the Armenian hypothesis either. For a word *emio* with the above meaning could not be discovered in Armenian But now there is nothing in the way of the reading *mio* with the meaning 'one,' and the Armenian indefinite article *mi* is now to be recovered in this very form from the Hittite inscriptions, as the definite article *n* in the form (*i*)*no*.

Now, and of this also I could take cognisance in my book, the great goddess at Boghazkai and Fraktin has the attribute *m-*' and at Bor the attribute *m-a* (or *o*). So long as I held to *emio* = 'great,' 'powerful,' or the like, I read these groups as derivatives from this word, and had to read them so. But now that *emio* is replaced by *mio* = 'one,' this will not answer, and we must look in another direction. What then? If the king of the gods was called *papa* or *baba* as the 'father,' the idea obtrudes itself upon one that in *m-*' or *m-a* (perhaps read *ma-a*), an attribute of the queen of the gods, we ought to see a term of endearment used in the cultus for 'mother.' Now at Bor *m-a* occurs twice in clear parallelism with this very term, *papa*. Yes, and for a long time past it has been inferred from a note of Strabo's that at Komana in the Taurus, in 'Hittite' territory, *Ma* was the cultus-name of the great queen of the gods!

With this I conclude my reply.

I think I have no reason to fear that any unprejudiced person will deny that a deciphering which has such results to show has hit the mark. And even Professor Sayce will not protest, but rather silently content himself with the glory of having been one of the first, and for long the most zealous of all, to popularize the Hittites. The inscriptions *are* deciphered. The problem *is* solved.[1]

As an appendage I submit a specimen of translation with a transcription, of course only approximately correct, as the result of my deciphering. In the latter I give only the written signs that were actually read, without the determinatives and other auxiliary signs which were not meant to be read. Anyone, even Professor Sayce, will concede to me that a system of decipherment from which the following can be gathered as the contents of an

[1] See now especially the reviews of my book in the *GGA* (1899, No. 1) by Dr. Brockelmann, and in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* (1899, No. 3) by Dr. Schwally. A third review, by Professor Zimmern, also completely accepting my results, including the Armenianism of the language, will appear very soon in the *ZDMG*.

inscription, must be correct,—in short, that the inscriptions are deciphered.

The Inscription of Bor.[1]

Suennezi Tarz(oi)io dzar(i)o dzar(i)o dei g(u)r-(or m(a)r-) Mudl- ario . . . Sanda- arbats(i)o eso papa-arwaio (?) usdar Pharnā (?) aro aro maā eso a- ? Tarz(oi)io ? -oio papa- dēwā (?) maā medziā ? Tarz(oi)io Suennezio (?) Kh(i)l(i)kioio dzar(i)oio deio deio medzio zawa(i)- ino ai-.

'The Syennesis, the king of Tarsus, the king (and) lord, the . . . Mudl-, the valiant, . . . the servant (?) of Sanda, I, the 'Father's,' the prince's (?) son, the man of Pharna (?), the man of the 'Mother,' I, the . . . man (?) of the mighty Father of Tarsus (and) of the goddess the great Mother, of ? the Syennesis (?) of Tarsus, the Cilician, the king (and) lord, the great lord child-the (is) this.'

[1] Upon a stele, above the figure of a king.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. By C. A. Briggs, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* 8vo, pp. xxii, 688. 12s. net.)

Orthodox books do not sell. When a book is written in open defence of some traditional position, it rarely reaches a second edition, it rarely pays its way. The orthodox count it obvious, the heterodox absurd. But when a strong book appears attacking a tradition, both orthodox and heterodox buy it. This is perhaps God's providence, in line with the activity of childhood, which is wearing out restlessness to the invalid mother, but the condition of progress in the race. *Lex Mosaica* was still-born, Driver's *Introduction* and Briggs' *Biblical Study* have run into numerous editions.

Briggs' *Biblical Study* has run into ten editions. When the ninth was exhausted, Dr. Briggs resolved to make it a new book, and give it a new title. He used the old book as nucleus of new material, he doubled its size, and called it a *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture.* To the old book many of us owe an immense debt. The new is greater and more serviceable.

It is an American book. Now in America there is a great gulf fixed between the old position and the new. The majority of American theologians refuse even to look at the new methods of studying the Old Testament. The minority accept them with a thoroughness as sweeping. In this country criticism moves more slowly, but it carries more volume of scholarship with it. This is enough to explain a certain feeling which the English reader has, and which he would not describe as critical swagger if he could find an inoffensive word to convey it. But we have now learned so much of the new methods from our own teachers, that the very difference here will be its best recommendation.

The whole field of the study of the Bible is covered. Textual and historical criticism, poetry, theology, archæology, all find a place, and the volume is large enough to afford them all a sufficient place. The references to literature are numerous, and neither biassed by friendship nor misleading through ignorance. The range and accuracy of the scholarship combine to produce one of its chief surprises. And there is no forgetfulness of higher claims. The last three chapters discuss the Credibility of Holy Scripture, the Truthfulness of Holy Scripture, and Holy Scripture as a means of Grace. They should be read first by those who have a prejudice against Professor Briggs the Higher Critic.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By A. B. Bruce, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* Post 8vo, pp. xii, 451. 7s. 6d.)

Professor Bruce's books are all educative. It may be to agree, it may be to disagree, but they draw one out. There is no folding of the hands to slumber. And this is a most characteristic book, as it is in fact the favourite book. This is the subject Dr. Bruce has given himself to most and on which he feels he has most to say. Now

it is impossible to deny, and it would be useless to conceal, that on many exegetical particulars we do not and cannot follow Professor Bruce. But that does not make his book less welcome to us,—rather more so; it drives us to think and read and possibly learn. And when the opposition is at its utmost, the book remains quite fascinating in the freedom and rush of its conviction. No one could write a more living exposition than Professor Bruce, and Professor Bruce has never written a more living exposition than this.

CHURCH IDEAS IN SCRIPTURE AND SCOTLAND. By James Rankin, D.D. (*Blackwood*. Crown 8vo, pp. 278. 6s.)

The ideas of the Church which Dr. Rankin finds in Scripture are simple: one Church for each country and no interference; how it came, and what it is, are matters which are nobody's business. Now in Scotland these are not the only ideas of the Church, and Dr. Rankin is distressed. 'Three years ago, during another holiday on the Lower Seine at Caudebec, of about 3000 population, what a pleasure it was for two Sundays to worship with a people with only one church, and that large and of surpassing beauty, fit to have been a cathedral! On the quaint old streets were no cross-currents of church and chapel goers, trying not to see one another, or showing their teeth as they met, like shepherds' collies at a market, but all converging to one shrine and market of the place. I could not help thinking of distracted Crieff beside me at home, where with only twice the population there are no fewer than *nine* competing churches, not two of them friends, unless temporarily for some plot. Add to these nine cat-and-dog congregations, several pendicles of little Bethels worked by means of coal, bovril, soirees, shillings, and old clothes, not to speak of games and teas for the children. It will not do to join Caudebec with Paradise; nor is Crieff quite pandemonium; but the temptation lies in the direction of so pairing and comparing, to one who knows each in its church-going.'

But mark the hesitation of that last sentence; it is full of significance.

VICTORY OVER SIN AND DEATH. By G. S. Smith, M.A., D.D. (*Blackwood*. Crown 8vo, pp. 267. 5s.)

Dr. Smith would be called an old-fashioned preacher now. For he preaches nothing but fulness of salvation through Jesus Christ. He is, in short, just as old-fashioned as St. Paul; and those who have forsaken St. Paul will not follow Dr. Smith. But how wholesome to the rest of us such sermons are! Not a strained word, not a glaring thought. It is Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God.

Messrs. Blackwood have now published the second volume of Tiele's *Elements of the Science of Religion* (pp. 286, 7s. 6d. net). It contains the Gifford Lectures delivered in Edinburgh in 1898, and covers the ontological part of the subject. That part is of more interest, and is more keenly discussed at present, than the morphological part which occupied the first course and filled the first volume. But they must be taken together. Together they form one of the best, because one of the most far-seeing and truly scientific, of all the Gifford Lectures. There is neither apology for Christianity nor opposition to it. And Christianity gains greatly and unmistakably thereby.

HORAE SYNOPTICAE. By the Rev. Sir John C. Hawkins, Bart., M.A. (Oxford: *At the Clarendon Press*. 8vo, pp. xvi, 183. 7s. 6d.)

This we believe to be the most important contribution to the Synoptic Problem that has been made by English scholarship for at least a decade. It does not solve the problem. It does not try to solve it. It is a student's book, and furnishes the student with materials. If he can use them and solve the Synoptic Problem with them, Sir John Hawkins will rejoice, but he himself is not able to do it. He does not think the problem is ready for solution.

But if it is not ready, will it ever be? Will it ever be ready along these lines? They are the most approved lines at present, the lines Professor Sanday has made dominant. But it is just because so much has been done on these lines, done so patiently and so scientifically by so many equipped workers, of whom Sir John Hawkins is one, that we are driven to wonder if the solution lies along these lines at all.

Be that as it may, this book is at present, and will be for some time, the student's best guide into the great problem. It is the accumulated result of many years' hard labour. It consists mainly of tables of words—peculiarities of St. Matthew, peculiarities of St. Mark, and the like.

These tables are here once and for all. And the remarks made on them are acute as well as restrained. Besides its immediate purpose, it will be a valuable addition to our literature on New Testament Greek. It should be placed in that respect beside Dr. Kennedy's *Sources*. It will be found on every New Testament scholar's table.

THE UNHEEDING GOD. By Thomas G. Selby. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* Crown 8vo, pp. 384. 6s.)

Mr. Selby is a man of great versatility and great vigour. He can tell Chinese stories, translating them as he goes, and he can preach sermons which carry the conviction of the extempore, and yet pass into the printing press as English literature. As a preacher—and it is as a preacher we have now to do with him—he is all practice. He knows nothing of the swing of theological formulæ, he does not stay to repeat the doctrines of redeeming grace. 'If ye know these things'—and if not, ye must learn them somewhere else—'happy are ye if ye do them.' The 'facts of life' and the 'miracle of civilization' are the phrases that abound. And so the sermons are galvanic shocks —which we need as much as anything. Yes, Mr. Selby is right; it is *doing* that we must attend to now.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have resolved to issue Dr. Joseph Parker's *Sermons* in sixpenny monthly parts. The first part contains five sermons and six prayers. The prayers we do not like. The sermons are surprisingly clever and impressive.

MEDITATIONS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By B. W. Randolph, M.A. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. 371. 6s.)

The Meditations are those of a theological professor, and they are intended to teach theological students how to meditate. There is a page for every day of the year. A text is chosen, and on it are fixed two 'Preludes,' three 'Points,' and a suggestion for the 'Affections and the Will.' The scheme may seem mechanical and strained. But you can do anything with the Bible. Every text furnishes matter for all these exercises, and there is no restraint but the restraint of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

THE HISTORY OF MANKIND. By Professor Friedrich Ratzel. Translated by A. J. Butler, M.A. (*Macmillan.* Vol. iii. 8vo, pp. 599, with Coloured Plates, Maps, and Illustrations. 12s. net.)

The previous volumes of this noble book have been so warmly welcomed, that little more need be said on the appearance of the third and last volume, than that it is as lavishly illustrated and as idiomatically translated as they. The student of ethnology has now in his hands (and at a most reasonable price) a work of the utmost scientific value as well as the greatest popular interest. There are few subjects which need strict scientific treatment more than ethnology. For the delusions are widespread and deep-rooted, however ridiculous some of them may be. But in order to accomplish the death of these delusions, it is necessary to get at the reader for pleasure as well as the reader for profit. And Professor Ratzel in his conscientious translator's hands can be read with the utmost ease and delight. The illustrations are, however, the book's chief wealth. How often is one caught saying, 'What is man that Thou art mindful of him?' as these warriors in paint and feathers flash their petty awfulness on the eye! War is the one trade that is worth practising, and oh! the contemptible misery of the practice of it.

The 'Eversley' Series, the most chaste of convenient handbooks in the world, would not be complete without its edition of Shakespeare. So Professor Herford is to edit the 'Eversley' edition with introductions and notes, and it is to run into ten volumes. The first volume has appeared. It contains a general introduction of 19 pages, then four plays with brief literary introduction and very brief explanatory notes to each. The paper is white and soft, the type bourgeois, and the lines are numbered to correspond with the 'Globe' and the 'Cambridge' *Shakespeares* and Bartlett's *Concordance*. This new edition will strengthen Messrs. Macmillan's position as *the* publishers of Shakespeare, innumerable as the publishers of Shakespeare are.

PILKINGTON OF UGANDA. By C. F. Harford-Battersby, M.A., M.D. (*Marshall Brothers.* Post 8vo, pp. xvi, 346, with Maps and Portrait. 6s.)

The title *Pilkington of Uganda* is chosen purposely to link this biography with that of *Mackay of Uganda*. Between the two the whole tale of missionary work in Uganda is told, to the year

1897. It is a stirring and also a moving tale. There is no time to go to sleep, no time for the missionaries, and no time for the reader of their biographies. It is revival or rebellion, and the one is as hot as the other. Alas! the rebellion has been most frequent and most persistent as yet. Out of that has come the untimely death of these brave men, and much suffering to those who have been allowed to live. Still it is a hopeful narrative. There are great things in store for such a country. They will come in like a flood—not to destroy but to fertilize—when they come.

The question of Pilkington's death is always a matter of debate. Did he right to be in the battle? The whole story is told here unreservedly, and the editor does not doubt he did right.

For the rest, the book is well written and of incessant interest.

Messrs. Marshall Brothers now issue a compact and surprisingly complete Bible Dictionary, formerly issued by Messrs. Saxon, and call it *The Keswick Bible Dictionary* (pp. 428, 1s.). They also publish in their 'Keswick Library' a little volume of daily meditation, by Sophia M. Nugent, entitled *Instead.*

THE BOOK OF JOB. By Edgar C. S. Gibson, D.D. (*Methuen*, 8vo, pp. 236. 6s.)

Under the editorship of Professor Lock, a new series of commentaries on Holy Scripture, to be called 'Oxford Commentaries,' is promised by Messrs. Methuen. This is the first volume. The general editor describes the place of the series, first negatively—'less elementary than the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools,' less critical than the 'International Critical Commentary,' less didactic than the 'Expositor's Bible'; and then positively—each volume will contain an introduction on the modern criticism of the book, its contribution to religious thought, and a paraphrase of the text with notes and excursuses. And this volume, at least, contains an index of subjects. The appearance of the volume is attractive, and notwithstanding the unfortunate choice, the substance of it is not disappointing. To start the series with Job was an unfortunate choice, because Davidson's *Job* in the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools' is actually less elementary than this, fuller of detail, and (it must be added) farther of insight. In short, the volume will not stand comparison with Davidson, and gives no reason for its existence except that the series must be complete. But that is because Davidson is so exceptional. Dr. Gibson has done excellent work before, and this is excellent also.

In one respect Dr. Gibson could have advanced beyond Dr. Davidson. He could have used more recent literature. That chance, however, he seems to have thrown away. In natural history he has nothing more recent to refer to than Tristram's old volume, and he ignores the three great volumes of Thomson's *Land and the Book*, and is content with the early small edition.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. By Rayner Winterbotham, M.A., LL.B., B.Sc. (*Methuen.* Crown 8vo, pp. 268. 3s. 6d.)

Readers of the earlier volumes of the *Expositor* remember the name of Winterbotham. These sermons may not have been preached yesterday, of course, but if they have, they prove that the old expository hand has not lost its cunning. They are expositions of the Parables. And although there are many expositions of the Parables about, these are separate enough to be remembered. The note of distinction is readiness to carry our Lord's teaching all the way. Mr. Winterbotham has his prejudices. He has one hard-baked prejudice that takes one's breath away. But he is almost miraculously free from prejudice as an expositor. We must touch the book elsewhere.

CLOVELLY SERMONS. By the late William Harrison, M.A. (*Methuen.* 8vo, pp. 196. 3s. 6d.)

The sermons are in no way striking. They lose to us the echoing accent which makes their charm to those who heard them preached, and especially to the filial ear of 'Lucas Malet,' who edits them. Still they are thoughtful and responsible. There is almost a burden of responsibility in some of them, drawing the thought towards its darker colourings. 'Lucas Malet' confesses the pessimism. But it should not be. 'Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy'—that is the only preaching that should be.

FAMOUS SCOTS: ADAM SMITH. By Hector C. Macpherson. (*Oliphant.* Crown 8vo, pp. 160. 1s. 6d.)

If the 'Famous Scots' Series had given us this work alone, it would not have been a series perhaps, but it would have been born to purpose. It is true there is a good deal in the book that is strained and overstated. Mr. Macpherson has a rooted

antipathy to 'orthodoxy,' which means the particular stage of enlightenment that the majority of educated persons have at any time reached. He is himself an orthodox person now. And to blame orthodoxy for suspecting the good intentions of Hutcheson, Smith, or Hume is to expect the truth to proceed without struggle. The theologians of Smith's day were surely no more to blame than the Glasgow hammermen, who, as Mr. Macpherson remarks, boycotted James Watt because he had not served his apprenticeship within the burgh.

So there are these unripe thoughts in the book. And there is such a sentence as this: 'At the time, as Carlyle reminds us, when Scotland was studying Boston's *Fourfold State*, England was enjoying the works of Steele and Addison,' a most foolish, as well as unpatriotic sentence, for Boston has made better men than all the kindred of Addison and Steele since the world began. Still the book is of great price. It is complete, proportioned, vivid, the picture of a great man, and with all its brevity, worthy of his greatness.

Messrs. Oliphant have also published (in a handsome form and at a moderate price) a new edition of a well-established book on *The Tabernacle*, by William Brown (pp. 315, 3s. 6d.). Its attitude is old-fashioned, which will be a good recommendation to most. Its information is on the whole accurate, though a little out of date in unessential particulars.

OUR PRAYER BOOK: CONFORMITY AND CONSCIENCE. By W. Page Roberts, M.A. (*Smith, Elder, & Co.* Crown 8vo, pp. 290. 6s.)

If Canon Roberts' book should fall into the right hands, it is capable of great good. He has published it for the sake of men or women who are slipping away from the Church and Christianity. He preached it for them first. So he demands as little as possible of them in the way of dogmatic belief—nothing, in fact, which they cannot reasonably give him. There is no need to demand more at first. If we should be able to give a reason for the hope that is in us, we should be able to make the hope that is in us reasonable. And of course Canon Roberts does not mean that the minimum of belief is commendable in itself. The pity is that our faith has ever to be presented in relation to dogmatics. It is a living thing, as simple and as complex as life itself. Sir, we would see Jesus. But things have gone wrong with us, and we must reason and argue now. Canon Page Roberts does that with unmistakable persuasiveness.

A COMMENTARY ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN. By D. Theol. Ernst Dryander. (*Stock.* Crown 8vo, pp. x, 255. 5s.)

The Commentary is in the form of addresses. These addresses are very simple and practical. They seem to be spoken to an audience that does not know much about it. They demand no knitting of the brow in thought, and no scourging of the soul in effort. They are very pious and very pleasant.

The Bishop of Worcester has published, through Mr. Elliot Stock, a most scholarly and Christian book, entitled *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper cleared from Certain Misconceptions* (pp. xii, 136, 3s. 6d.). There seems just one way to meet it. Dr. Perowne rests his argument on Scripture. Accept the basis, and the argument is irresistible. But if you deny the basis, the argument has to fall back on experience. And men are so strangely different that experience is ranged on both sides clamorously. Dr. Perowne's hope is with those who have not taken a side yet. Let them read this book and consider before they do.

Three new volumes have been published of Mr. Sheldon's works by the Sunday School Union—*Richard Bruce*, *The Twentieth Door*, and *Malcolm Kirk*. They deal with different social questions, and always impressively. The edition is a good one and very cheap.

TESTIMONIES TO CHRIST. By the Rev. C. J. Ball, M.A. (*Wells Gardner.* Crown 8vo, pp. 372. 6s.)

There are many ways of writing the Life of the Lord Jesus Christ. Mr. Ball's way is by testimony. He quotes the testimony of many persons and things, the testimony of Christ Himself, of the Spirit, of the Church, of Science, of Revolution, and he not only finds the text for it, but he offers a short telling exposition of the text. It is a volume of sermons, no doubt. But why not? The Life of the Lord can be written in sermons as well as in chapters. And the publishers have been so happy in their workmanship that the book comes commended before you know its spiritual benefit.

Under the title of *Good Shepherds* (pp. 87, 1s. 6d.), Messrs. Wells Gardner have published a searching manly volume of addresses to candidates for Holy Orders, by the Bishop of Stepney. It is a good divine that follows these instructions.

Messrs. Williams & Norgate are the publishers in this country of a remarkable volume, entitled *Creation Myths of Primitive America*, by Jeremiah Curtin. Manifestly it touches biblical things closely. It is besides of great scientific value. And the author is able to present the various myths in so pleasing a form that the book becomes, even to the unbiblical and unscientific reader, most attractive reading.

Was our Lord Crucified on the 14th or 15th of Nisan?

By Dr. E. W. G. Masterman, St. John's College, Cambridge.

The question of the exact date of our Lord's Crucifixion is one of interest from every point of view, but it has a real and practical importance because of the bearing of the subject on the relation of the synoptists to the author of the Fourth Gospel. No one will dispute that an unbiassed reading of the three Synoptical Gospels would lead an outsider to the conclusion that our Lord was crucified the day following the killing of the Passover lambs, *i.e.* on the 15th of Nisan. An examination of the Fourth Gospel in the same way, but independently of the other Gospels, would, in all probability, lead an equally unbiassed observer to conclude that at the time of our Lord's trial the Passover had not been eaten, and that therefore He was crucified on the 14th of Nisan, that is, when the Paschal lambs were slain. The first thought, too, might be that His death at that time was the most appropriate fulfilment of the type. I wish in this paper to make a few suggestions, tending to show that our Lord must have suffered on the 15th and not the 14th, and that the accounts in the four Gospels really completely harmonize.

As the explanations of the difficulties have been fully dealt with in many places, it will be only necessary to very briefly indicate the answers to the chief ones. With respect to the minor difficulties urged against the trial and death of our Lord occurring on the 15th of Nisan, a consideration of the fact that these must have been present to the minds of the writers of the Synoptical Gospels, and must have demanded an explanation from them *if they really existed then*, must assure us that they are the products of the conditions of a later time.

With regard to St. John's Gospel, it is essential at the outset to remember that the writer must have been familiar with the traditions, if not with some of the actual materials, used in the Synoptical Gospels. How is it, then, we have no hint that in his Gospel he is making a change in the common tradition? The supper mentioned in John 13, would certainly on the surface be considered by all those familiar with the synoptical tradition to mean the Paschal Supper.

The four chief passages in St. John's Gospel which require some explanation before we proceed farther, are 13^{29}, 18^{28}, 19^{14} and ^{31}.

1. It is stated in Jn 13^{29} that the disciples thought Judas had gone out to buy things needed 'against the feast.' It is supposed on this ground that the Supper could not be the Paschal feast. But if we examine this Gospel we shall find that 'the feast of the Passover,' or 'the Passover,' is constantly used to include the *whole* feast, *i.e.* the Passover proper and the feast of unleavened bread. Might not Judas have gone out—their Passover proper being ended—to buy what was needed for the succeeding day? But could shops have been opened at such a time? It is possible they were not, and that this fact the disciples momentarily forgot in the midst of their preoccupation; but it is also more than possible that there were some means whereby late comers to the holy city might get some necessities on an emergency.

2. In Jn 18^{28}, we read that the chief priests and the captors of Jesus went not into the judgment hall lest they should be defiled, 'but that they might eat the Passover,'—ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα.

Now it is fully admitted that τὸ πάσχα is used several times in this Gospel, and also in Lk 22[1], to signify the whole seven days' feast, and though to 'eat the Passover' does not occur elsewhere as referring to all the special food of that period, there seems no difficulty in recognizing the possibility. So great an authority as Dr. Edersheim[1] admits that such a usage is quite permissible. The other clause, 'Lest they should be defiled,' I shall refer to later.

3. Jn 19[14] contains the phrase, 'It was the preparation of the Passover.' This, though at first a great difficulty, is understood when we compare the phrase with that in Mk 15[40]. Here the word ἡ παρασκευὴ—'the preparation,' is explained to mean 'the day before the Sabbath,' *i.e.* Friday. In other words, we may read—'It was the Friday of the Passover (week),' which makes the events in all the Gospels coincide. This reading (of ἡ παρασκευὴ = Friday) is now so fully recognised as permissible by all competent scholars, that it is unnecessary to dwell upon it further.

4. The phrase in Jn 19[31], 'That Sabbath day was a high day,' has been explained as implying that the first day of the feast (15th of Nisan) came on that day, and therefore it was a feast-Sabbath as well as a legal Sabbath. Surely such an explanation cannot be used to support the idea that the crucifixion was on the 14th of Nisan? For in the other view we find the Sabbath to have been a High day, firstly, because it was the Sabbath of the Passover week—always a great Sabbath among the Jews; and secondly, according to this reckoning, the Sabbath would fall on the 16th of Nisan,—the second day of the feast,—when the wave-offering had to be made.

Having now very briefly indicated the lines on which the main difficulties in St. John's Gospel may be met, I wish to show one or two reasons, gathered from the history in that Gospel, why our Lord *must* have been betrayed, tried, and crucified on the 15th of Nisan. The Paschal Supper was, and is to-day, eaten on the 15th of Nisan, the day beginning at sunset—the sunset of Thursday, as we reckon time. The Paschal lambs had been killed 'between the evenings,' shortly before sunset on the 14th; that is, in the afternoon of the same day, only earlier.

Firstly, then, Why did Judas Iscariot choose this time of all others to betray his Master?

[1] See references at end.

It would seem that since the Feast of Dedication, the previous December, our Lord had been away from Jerusalem up to this week. During all the previous days of this week He had, apparently, returned for the night to Bethany, where he was among many friends. This Passover night was the *first* night our Lord was in the city. The rulers had been afraid to take Jesus 'because of the people,' and had expressly desired to avoid arresting Him 'on the feast' (R.V.). Judas, however, knew our Lord's movements, he had been goaded to desperation by our Lord's words (Jn 13[27]), and he recognized an opportunity which was never likely to occur again. Most probably in his own mind he had really long planned for this particular night. And why? Because this—the Passover night—was just the night above all others when Jesus could be arrested quietly and brought *unknown to the whole multitude* to the high priest's house.

Those who are familiar with Passover nights in Jewish cities (I speak from an experience of four Passovers in Jerusalem), must have remarked the entirely deserted streets that night—not a Jew is to be seen. Although not absolutely legally binding, nevertheless at this season (as in Ex 12[26]) all Jews remain indoors. I think we may consider that such was probably the case that night. Renan states: 'As the feast of the Passover which commenced that year on a Friday evening was a time of bustle and excitement, it was resolved to anticipate it; . . . the arrest was therefore fixed for Thursday.' This is an extraordinary statement, for the evening *before* the Passover would have been just such an evening of bustle and excitement as would have made a quiet and secret arrest and conduct through the streets of the city to the place of trial impossible. Probably large numbers would be up all night finishing their preparations for the coming sacred days. As it was, on Passover night, Judas with his band could creep through deserted streets, bright in the full Paschal moon, and having effected the shameful arrest, could bring Him unknown to all but the hating chief priests and rulers to His trial. Probably not till Jesus was safely condemned did the majority of His friends in the city even know of His arrest.

Secondly, in referring back to Jn 18[28], we find the Jews would not enter the judgment hall 'lest they should be defiled.' What was the

nature of this defilement? If we accept the theory that this occurred on the 14th we have no explanation, for by sunset they could be purified ready for the Passover; but if on the 15th, the explanation is as clear as day to those who are familiar with Jewish customs. With the sunset of the 14th, *i.e.* the beginning of the 15th, began that period in which it was, and is, sin for any Jew to come in contact with the slightest *leaven*. Those who know the extreme precautions taken by the Jews of to-day to avoid the slightest chance of defilement during this feast, can easily understand that a heathen law court would be the last place 'the chief priests and rulers of the synagogues' would dare to enter. Defilement then would mar their whole feast. Defilement on the 14th, however, would not be too late for them, by changes of raiment and ablutions, to prepare themselves for keeping the feast.

And now lastly, though this cannot be perhaps used as an argument, What bearing has the date on the typical fulfilment of the Passover institution? Those who maintain that our Lord was crucified on the 14th, point out that he was the Paschal Lamb, and therefore died when they were slain—which even then would not be exactly the case. But it should be remembered that the *15th* was the Passover Day—the day of the great deliverance. It was in the night of the 15th (which *preceded* the day, as always in Eastern reckoning) that the angel of the Lord smote those whose doors were not sprinkled. The lamb was killed, it is true, shortly before the 15th, but only, as it seems, to be sure that it should be ready for the great day. It was killed in ancient times by the head of each household. It was the sprinkling of the blood and the consuming of the lamb which were the essentials of deliverance, as in the temple sacrifices it was the consumption and burning, not the killing, on which stress was laid. Now that no lamb is killed, the 14th has lost all significance, but the 15th remains to-day as the great day of Israel's deliverance.

Further, it is interesting to observe that the new symbols of the body and blood which our Lord instituted were to be the perpetual representatives of this new Passover. The new institution took place at the very day and hour of the old. In both cases the *feast* was the essential, only the symbols of the bread and wine were a higher development of the idea.

It would thus seem that our Lord's Last Supper, agony, arrest, trial, torture, crucifixion, death, and burial all occurred on the 15th of Nisan, the great day of the Passover in past ages and at the present time. 'For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us' (1 Co 5[7]).[1]

[1] Full popular discussions of this subject will be found in Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, special note 'On the Day of the Crucifixion'; Plummer, *St. John's Gospel* ('Cambridge Bible for Schools'), special appendix; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, special appendix. All these support a view different from the above. Also Edersheim, *The Temple and its Services* and *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, in favour of the 15th of Nisan view. In Andrews' *Life of our Lord*, the arguments on both sides are quoted and discussed, the decision being left open. See also Turner's article, 'Chronology of the New Testament,' in *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 411.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS xii. 1–3.

'Now the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

THE historian has reached the end of the first chief portion of his narrative; he has completed the introductory section of his grand composition; he has shown the origin of the world through the omnipotence of God, and the descent of the nations of the earth from one common ancestor; he has, by a universal pedigree, disclosed the beautiful hope that, however dispersed and inimical to each other the nations may be, they will, in a happier future, be reunited in brotherhood; but before the human family reaches this aim, it has to pass through a long and wearisome career: during unnumbered ages the various tribes will continue in hostility and warfare; for unmeasured periods the omnipotent Creator will be forgotten, and darkness will shroud the earth. In one tribe alone the spark of truth will be preserved, and through that tribe 'all the

families of the earth will be blessed.' In Abraham's race lives the hope of the world. This is the Hebrew writer's avowed principle; and henceforth he devotes his narrative exclusively to the destinies of that race.—KALISCH.

'Now the Lord said unto Abram.'—The former chapter had carried the history down to the death of Terah. The present chapter returns to the date of the call of Abram. In Ac 7^2 St. Stephen tells us, what also appears most likely from the history in Genesis, that God appeared to Abram, 'when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran.' This led our translators (A.V.) to render '*had said*.' The Hebrew lacks the pluperfect tense; but the continuous character of the narrative from this point marks the propriety of adopting a simple perfect, which is also the rendering of the ancient versions. The recounting briefly of events up to the death of Terah in the last chapter was by a prolepsis.—HAROLD BROWNE.

WE must not conceive of this speaking of God to Abraham as external; he heard the voice of God within him, in the inmost depth of his soul, which the New Testament calls πνεῦμα τοῦ νοός, and to which man must ever retire if he would hear the voice of God. The scene of this chiefly internal occurrence was, according to the meaning of the Toledoth of Terah, as we now have them, Haran (4b, xi. 31b); but the speech of Stephen (Ac 7^2), and many expositors who are not influenced by it (*e.g.* Kimchi), assume that the narrative reaches back to the time when the family of Abram still dwelt in Ur Casdim, and according to the prevailing view (15^7, Neh 9^7) the Divine intervention certainly dates thence.—DELITZSCH.

'Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house.'—The expressions are accumulated in order to point out that God made no small demand of him when He required him to sever his family ties, and wander forth as a stranger into a land as yet unknown to him.—DILLMANN.

'The land that I will show thee.'—Definite information regarding the goal of the journey is reserved to a later time. This makes God's demand appear all the harder. It was therefore the more necessary to intimate the purpose and object of the demand in the form of a promise, and this follows in v.$^{2f.}$—DILLMANN.

'I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse.'—Abram becomes a mediator of blessings for those in his neighbourhood, in that they, while acknowledging him as blessed of God, are themselves blessed, and for those remote in time and place, in that the report of Abram's blessing impels them to desire or share it. קָלַל (prop. *vilipendere*) was the more appropriate word for the blasphemous cursing of men; אָרַר for the judicial infliction of a curse on the part of God. And how significant it is, that they who bless are spoken of in the plural, and they who curse only in the singular! They who curse are only individuals who isolate themselves from that humanity which is destined to inherit the blessing.—DELITZSCH.

'In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.'—Not bless themselves by thee or in thy name; but in thee, as the progenitor of the promised seed, shall all the families of the ground (which was cursed on account of sin, chap. 3^{17}) be spiritually blessed; cf. Gal 3^8. Thus the second sense in which Abram was constituted a blessing lay in this, that the whole fulness of the Divine promise of salvation for the world was narrowed up to his line, by which it was in future to be carried forward, and at the appointed season, when the woman's seed was born, distributed among mankind.—WHITELAW.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Abraham's Call.

By the Rev. W. H. Hutchings, M.A.

I. THE CALL.—(1) Abram appears to have received the call in Haran, though he may have received a previous call in Mesopotamia (Ac 7^2). We may not know the precise place or number of times of God's appearance to Abram, but the call is clear.

(2) God's calls have always involved sacrifice. Religion must cost us something. It cost Abram country and kindred.

(3) Why should this be required of him? (*a*) His departure from the idolatrous Chaldees betokened separation from the world, such as Christ's religion would require (2 Co 6^{17}). (*b*) Leaving land and kindred betokened self-surrender, and the yielding up of possessions and affections to God.

(4) Christ laid down this law when He said, 'If any man come after Me, and hate not his father and mother and wife, he cannot be My disciple.'

II. THE RESPONSE.—(1) Abraham responded with faith and prompt obedience, the greater that he had not the example of Christ to aid him. Such faith and obedience entitled him to the name of 'the friend' of God.

III. THE PROMISE.—(1) All families of the earth should be blessed in him, that is, through Christ his descendant. St. Augustine says, 'Two promises were made to Abraham; one concerned Canaan; the other was far greater, and had relation to, not carnal, but spiritual seed, by which he is the father, not of one Israelite nation, but of all nations which follow in the footsteps of his faith.'

(2) The election of the chosen family was not an act of favouritism. Their sins were not overlooked, but the more severely judged (Am 3^2). They were not chosen to the exclusion of others, but in order to reach others. There is a danger of thinking of the privilege of the Divine choice apart from its duties and responsibilities.

II.

Be Thou a Blessing.

By the Rev. Morris Joseph.

The words are a command and a promise. Abraham is offered the Divine love, but from him human love must go out to the world. A life blessed of God must be a blessing to others. Abraham is represented in Jewish and Mussulman tradition as an apostle of truth and righteousness, and his life-work as of a missionary character. He breaks his father's idols, and calls upon the idolatrous Nimrod to acknowledge the true God. He has also a beautiful garden and guest-house, open to all wayfarers, where they are fed, clothed, and tended; for which Abraham will receive no reward, but bids them thank God.

The command and twofold duty is to us also. If we are religious, we may deepen the religious life of others; and, on the other hand, by our sympathy may refresh those who are weary and sad.

(1) Every religious man and woman must be a missionary for God. They must win souls, if not by active warfare, by the force of example. Their faith is itself a witness for religion, and when to that is clearly due the virtues of their everyday life, it is the strongest argument against the indifferent and the unbelieving. Let us not think it matters only to ourselves what we believe. We cannot live our lives alone. We all have the power of being an example, for good or for evil. If we are careless in religion, we injure others, just as, if our religion is a real thing to us, we may bless them by our example.

(2) We may also bless by loving deeds. Here also example is a blessing stirring others to imitation. As the rays of a solitary candle set in a window lighten the path and cheer the wayfarer, the effects of a simple deed of love may travel far. It may give peace and strength to those in need; it may be the turning-point of a life. We have not far to seek for such opportunities of blessing. We have first the demands of home-life that we should deny ourselves for the happiness of those dear to us. Beyond that there are wider possibilities in the misery of the world. The miseries crying for alleviation are often those that money cannot reach. What is wanted is helpfulness, energy, sympathy, and love.

Illustrations.

The passage is typical of many, addressed sometimes to Abraham, sometimes to one of the other patriarchs. All breathe the same spirit; most are expressed nearly in the same words. In part, the promises relate only to the nation of which the patriarchs are to be the ancestors; its numbers as the stars of heaven, or as the sand which is upon the seashore; the certainty with which it will enter into possession of Canaan, even to the ideal limits reached by the dominion of Solomon; the blessings of external prosperity which will flow to it. Elsewhere, a wider prospect is opened, and the nations of the earth are brought within the sphere of Israel's influence. Three times, it is said, through the patriarchs (or their seed) shall the families of the earth be blessed; twice, in passages due perhaps to another hand, it is said that they will bless themselves by it, *i.e.* will own it as a source of good, and desire for themselves the blessings proceeding from it. Objectively, in other words, the truth of which Israel is the organ and channel is to become a blessing to the world; and, subjectively, it is to be recognized by the world as such.—S. R. Driver.

When Abraham, not by human interest but by a Divine call, and even with an effort to overcome the struggling sympathies of his heart, left the paternal house, and his aged father, he was encouraged, not by promises of personal wealth and glory, but of a blessing which would ultimately prove the benediction of the human family. Abraham's emigration was a sacrifice unhesitatingly brought for an end concealed in an indefinite future, and scarcely fully understood by himself. Whilst the address of God was explicit and emphatic in describing the domestic felicity which he was commanded to renounce, it did not point out the least social compensation which he might expect in the strange land. No allusion was made to the possession of Canaan; it was only after he had reached the aim of his long journey that God for the first time promised it *to his descendants* (v.[7]); whilst Abraham himself, seeing it was in the hands of mighty heathen tribes, could during his life call no part of it his own, and was obliged to secure, by a heavy sum, a resting-place after his death.—M. M. Kalisch.

Abraham knew next to nothing of the vast plan of Providence of which his call was the initiatory step. We, however, can trace its development. Before he died he was a rich and powerful chieftain, though a sojourner in a strange land; before his grandson died, his tribe, already numerous, occupied an important district in Egypt, and a great-grandson was lord over all the land; before many centuries had elapsed, his posterity, increased to a great nation, returned to conquer the very Canaan which he was about to enter as a foreigner. The kingdom of David and Solomon sprang from his obedience. In process of time, also, the kingdom of One greater than Solomon, and both Abraham's and David's Lord, was established as an everlasting dominion, under which all nations of the earth

are to be blessed. Thus has it ever been. The greatest and happiest consequences have flowed from single acts of righteousness and faith.—E. W. SHALDERS.

SOME of us are as dead to the perception of God's gracious call, just because it has been sounding on uninterruptedly, as are the dwellers by a waterfall to its unremitting voice.—A. MACLAREN.

How the revelation of God came to Abraham we do not know, but there is a charming legend known to most of us. The scene, according to Dean Stanley, is laid, sometimes in Ur, sometimes in the celebrated hill above Damascus. He gives the story in the form in which it is preserved in the Koran. 'When night overshadowed him, Abraham saw a star, and said, "This is my Lord." But when the star set, he said, "I like not those who set." And when he saw the moon rising, he said, "This is my Lord." But when the moon set, he answered, "Verily, if my Lord direct me not in the right way, I shall be as one of those who err." And when he saw the sun rising, he said, "This is my Lord. This is greater than the star or moon." But when the sun went down, he said, "O my people, I am clear of these things. I turn my face to Him who hath made the heaven and the earth."'

The legend becomes more impressive when we remember that on the great plains of Central Asia, from the earliest times, the heavenly hosts received worship. But however the knowledge of the one true living God came to him, it was not a doubtful inference of his own from what he saw in the natural order of the world, or from the sovereignty of conscience. It was a revelation—not a hypothesis constructed by his own logical skill.—R. W. DALE.

Sermons for Reference.

Abrahams and Montefiore, Aspects of Judaism, 241.
Brown (J. B.), The Home and its Relation to Man and to Society, 22.
Bickersteth (E.), Condensed Notes on Scripture, 1.
Church (R. W.), Pascal, and other Sermons, 144.
Driver (S.), Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament, 50.
Farrar (F. W.), Eternal Hope, 220.
Godet (F.), Biblical Studies in the Old Testament, 10.
Joseph (M.), The Ideal in Judaism, 152.
M'Cheyne (R. M.), Basket of Fragments, 163.
Maurice (F. D.), Patriarchs and Lawgivers, 68.
Mozley (J.), Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, 1.
Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, ii. 337.
Parker (J.), People's Bible, i. 192.
Pressensé (E. L.), The Redeemer, 24.
Price (A. C.), Fifty Sermons, vi. 273.
Roberts (W. P.), Liberalism in Religion, 178.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xliii. 301.
Thorne (H.), Foreshadowings of the Gospel, 22.
Vaughan (J.), Fifty Sermons (1874), 293.
Wilberforce (S.), Sermons, 165.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Dalman's 'Die Worte Jesu.'[1]

DR. FAIRBAIRN has pointed out that the great difference between the library of a present-day theologian, as compared with one of the past generation, consists in the number of Lives of Christ, by men of all schools, tendencies, and Churches, which now abound. Younger men, who are so indebted to Farrar, Geikie, Edersheim, etc., can scarcely realize that such works are an entirely new feature in theological literature. This desire for the recovery of the historical Christ has given birth to valuable histories of New Testament times, and also, during the present decade more particularly, to a desire to know something of the actual language which Jesus spoke, and to apply modern methods to the study of contemporary Jewish literature. Several young men, ten or fifteen years ago, quite unknown to one another, seem to have been seized with a strong desire to ascertain what was the state of Jewish theology in the first century. We would like to know what of Christianity was the creation of our Lord and His apostles, and what was *appropriated* from current theological and eschatological beliefs, thus receiving the imprimatur and sanction of the founders of Christian theology. And in cases when our Lord and the Apostle Paul were in antagonism to Jewish creeds, many of us have felt that we should understand our New Testament better, if we knew what were the precise beliefs which are there opposed. To all who realize the value of these lines of investigation the appearance of Dalman's

[1] *Die Worte Jesu.* Mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen Jüdischen Schrifttums und der Aramäischen Sprache. Erörtert von Gustaf Dalman. Band i. Einleitung und wichtige Begriffe. Nebst anhang: Messianische texte. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. Price M. 8.50. Messianische texte allein. M. .50.

work on *The Words of Jesus*, 'studied with regard to extra-canonical Jewish writings and the Aramaic language,' is an event of great importance. Professor Dalman favours us with a bit of autobiography, and, with a pathos which struck a deeply responsive chord in *one* of his readers, he describes the immense obstacles which lay in the way of anyone who, ten years ago, might be smitten with a desire to study Aramaic literature, with the wish of elucidating thereby the words of our Redeemer. No one has done so much to remove these obstacles as Professor Dalman. His *Aramaic Grammar*, published in 1894, his *Specimens of Aramaic Dialects* (1896), and his *Lexicon*, now in process of publication, will render all *future* students of Aramaic his debtors to an extent they can but faintly realize; and the work before us is the matured product for which this long, dreary, patient investigation of Jewish dialects and literature was deliberately undertaken.

Die Worte Jesu is the first of several volumes projected by our author, in which he intends to compare the teachings of Jesus with the religious beliefs which were current among His contemporaries. He confines himself in the present volume to the more 'important conceptions' and phrases which occur in the Gospels, showing in what sense they were used by Jewish writers, and comparing this with the meaning which they have in the Gospels.

Inevitably, the work has a long Introduction. The one before us is intensely interesting to the Aramaic student: less so, perhaps, to the theologian. (1) The first section restates the evidence adducible to prove that Aramaic was the vernacular of Palestine in the time of our Lord. Here he has little to add to the evidence compiled by A. Meyer in *Jesu Muttersprache*, and Th. Zahn in his *Einleitung in das N.T.*, in which last-named work the first chapter is devoted to 'the original language of the Gospel.' (2) The second section discusses the literary use of Hebrew; and claims a Hebrew original for all the pseudepigrapha, *i.e.* works written under the name of O.T. worthies; and with reference to the Book of Daniel, he advocates the remarkable view that all the first six chapters were first written in Aramaic and the last six in Hebrew. The redactor, we are told, translated 1^1–2^4 into Hebrew, and chap. 7 into Aramaic. (3) He then treats of *Semitisms* in the Synoptic Gospels. He uses this term intentionally, because he recognizes that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels were under two Semitic influences: (*a*) the Hebrew, underlying the Septuagint, which was the model of Jewish Greek; and (*b*) the Aramaic, which was the vernacular of the evangelists, and also probably the language in which the Logia were first penned. Dalman regrets that this twofold influence has not been sufficiently regarded. Schmiedel, in his new edition of *Winer's Grammar*, complains that the Aramaic ingredients of N.T. diction have not received due attention, but his distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms is untenable; and Blass, in his *Grammar*, speaks of Hebræo-Aramaic influence on the N.T. idiom, but makes no attempt to separate between the two at all; and in his *Evangelium sec. Lucam*, the so-called Aramaisms are partly just as good Hebraisms, and partly not Aramaisms at all. He complains also of lack of attention to the *Graecisms* of the Gospels; *i.e.* phrases which have no immediate Semitic equivalent, and for which the Hellenistic author is responsible. Dr. Dalman maintains that, in endeavouring to arrive at the original Aramaic form of a *logion*, one must carefully eliminate the Graecisms. This, however, would require great caution; as a free Greek translation or even paraphrase may sometimes cover a real Aramaic expression. (4) Our author then examines a few commonplace words which are due to Semitic influence, such as (*a*) the superfluous use of ἀφείς = 'he left,' ἤρξατο = 'he began,' and εὐθύς = 'immediately,' 'straightway,' which are pure Aramaisms; (*b*) the use of εἶναι with the participle for a historic tense, and the redundant use of 'he came,' 'he stood,' 'he sat down,' 'he rose,' which are found in both Aramaic and Hebrew; while (*c*) the use of 'and it came to pass,' 'and he spake saying,' 'he answered and said,' are pure Hebrew, and are due to the influence of the LXX, which was 'the classic' for Hellenistic Jews. Certainly they are not due to a Hebrew primitive Gospel. The distribution of these phrases among the evangelists is somewhat remarkable and unexpected. (5) Dalman next traverses the proofs assigned by Resch for a Hebrew primitive Gospel, and arrives at the conclusion repeatedly expressed by myself in the *Critical Review*, that Resch's reliance, all but exclusively, on synonyms would equally well prove an Aramaic or an Arabic urevangelium (p. 35). (6) As to an original

Aramaic Gospel, Dalman believes that the words of Jesus were first circulated in Aramaic, orally, or in written form; but seems strongly of opinion that on one but himself possesses the needful linguistic equipment for retranslating the Greek into Aramaic. He admits that the present writer was the first to open up the subject in modern times, but passes his investigations by with a curt notice, and only alludes to Wellhausen's and Nestle's retranslations from Greek into Aramaic to show that 'it is possible for scholars to be familiar with Edessene Syriac and even the Christian-Palestinian dialect' and yet be hopelessly incompetent for the task of reproducing the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord. (7) Dalman then defines the nature of the task he has undertaken in the present volume. He does not attempt to give us an Aramaic Gospel by retranslating Christ's discourses, but deems it enough that it is absolutely certain that Jesus spoke Aramaic, and that His apostles propagated His teachings in that language; and he seeks to inquire, so far as the more important conceptions and phrases of the Gospels are concerned, what words Jesus would actually employ, and what sense these words would have for Jewish hearers. He does not consider that sufficient evidence has yet been adduced for an Aramaic account of the *deeds* of Christ, as distinct from His sayings. On this point I must still venture to dissent. I am strongly of opinion that an Aramaic original lies behind the incidents of the Galilean ministry, which Mark records in common with Matthew and Luke. Dalman now presents to us a list of works on Jewish theology, but finds that almost all are sadly lacking in an independent knowledge of later Jewish literature. Charles, Ryle, and James have still a great deal to learn. Even Weber's new edition is not satisfactory. All, save only Bacher, leave us often in the lurch. In fact, one conspicuous feature of the work before us is that (with one or two exceptions) the author never alludes to the work of *any* of his predecessors with commendation. We cannot help being impressed by his erudition, but his superiority would have been more cheerfully conceded, if it had been less superciliously claimed. (8) The last chapter of the Introduction is devoted to 'the choice of dialect,' and in opposition to Nöldeke, Buhl, Cornill, and myself, he finally decides that the Palestinian Targums are not to be relied on, but that, lexically, we must rely on the vocabulary of the Targum of Onkelos, together with the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash, as that which will yield us the precise words used by our Lord.

Having now spent more time than I intended on the Introduction, I pass on to the main body of the work, which is entitled 'Important Conceptions.' And very properly the first to be considered is 'The Kingdom of Heaven,' *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, for which the Jewish equivalent is, in Aram., מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא; in Heb., מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם. In this connexion, שָׁמַיִם is always anarthrous, and therefore is merely a substitute for God, due to Jewish reverence in avoiding the Divine name; and the phrase 'the kingdom of *heaven*' would, on this account, be used by our Lord; and of this, 'the kingdom of God,' in Mark and Luke, would be an alteration to suit Greek readers. Dalman insists that our rendering '*kingdom* of God' is misleading. An Oriental kingdom, now as in antiquity, is not a State in our sense of the word, nor a people or country viewed collectively, but a government which embraces a definite territory; and in reply to Stanton, Candlish, and Wittichen, who take the word to include the ideas both of 'reign' and 'kingdom,' he urges that the former must be tenaciously adhered to (p. 78). Ἡ *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* is the *Gottesherrschaft*, 'the Divine rule,' 'the theocracy.' According to Jewish conception, this 'kingly rule' on earth began when Abraham made God known. Under Sinai, Israel submitted to the 'kingly rule,' and from that day forward its earthly presence has been in Israel. The proselyte who accepts the law takes upon himself the 'Divine rule' (מְקַבֵּל עָלָיו מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם), and 'puts on the *yoke* of heaven.' The Jews anticipated, however, a fuller unfolding of the 'Divine rule,' in the deliverance of Israel from foreign oppression, and in the bringing of the nations to submit to the 'Divine rule.' There can be no doubt that to conceive of ἡ *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* as 'the kingly rule of God,' or 'the Divine rule,' helps us to understand many passages in the Gospels more lucidly. The 'kingly rule of God' can, better than *the kingdom*, be the subject of 'joyous proclamation' (Lk 4^{23}), of 'discourse' (Lk 9^{11}), and of 'promise' (Ja 2^{5}). It can 'be at hand' (Mat 4^{17}), and 'appear' (Lk 19^{11}). The Divine rule can be '*received* as a little child' (Mk 10^{15}), it may even be 'sought for' (Lk 12^{31})

and 'found' (Mat 7^{7}), and it can certainly be 'within' us (Lk 17^{21}). But there are other cases in which the *local* conception of a kingdom comes out more prominently, and which seem to justify the statement of Stanton (*Jewish and Christian Messiah*, pp. 217 f.): 'Kingdom includes both ideas, that of royal authority and the realm over which the king rules.' 'Reclining at meat' (*ἀνακλίνεσθαι*) (Mat 8^{11}), 'eating bread' (Lk 14^{15}), more naturally suggest 'in the *kingdom*' as a place, than 'in the *kingly rule*.' So also does the phrase 'the *keys* of the kingdom' (Mat 16^{19}). And locality is certainly prominent, when we read of 'shutting up' (Mat 23^{13}) and 'shutting out' (Mat 22^{13}, Lk 13^{28}); and of its being 'prepared' (Mat 25^{34}). In fact, after having throughout kept uniformly to the rendering *Gottesherrschaft* = 'Divine rule' as the rendering of *βασιλεία* in all its usages, Dalman admits at the close that in the mouth of Jesus the *βασιλεία* signified 'the Divine might which ever in constant progress effects the renewal of the world, and *also* the renewed world, into the realm of which men can one day enter, which even now can be offered, and therefore as a good thing can be grasped and received' (p. 112). Dalman is very severe on Schnedermann for stating that Jesus did no more than adopt the popular conception of the kingship of God. The submission to the 'kingly rule' was something totally different from the daily recitation of the 'Shema' (Dt 6^{4}). It was something essentially inner and ethical—the reign of God in the heart; and the submission of every faculty and propensity to the obedience of Christ.

II. Dalman next discusses the phrase, *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, 'the coming age' (Mk 10^{30}). There is no certain trace of this conception in Jewish literature before the Christian era. It occurs once in Enoch (71^{15}), but this passage is of late authorship, and the same is true of the Apoc. of Baruch. The later additions, written after the destruction of Jerusalem, contain it, but not the earlier. The oldest testimony for the use of the phrase is in Pirke Aboth, ii. 8, where Hillel says: 'He who acquires the words of the law, acquires for himself the life of the age which is to come.' The origin of the phrase is to be sought in the prophetic expression 'the day of Jehovah,' which is rendered in the Targum, 'the day which is about to come from before Jehovah.' Dalman considers also that the use of עוֹלָם in the sense of 'life-time,' 'a cycle,' 'era,' or 'age,' is due to contact with the Greek *αἰών*, either directly or through the medium of the Syriac.

III. Next, the phrase 'eternal life,' *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, receives attention. There are two equivalents for this in Jewish theology: 'the life of the age (עוֹלָם) which is to come,' and 'the life of eternity,' *i.e.* endless life and life in the coming æon, are both implied. Professor Dalman maintains that the difference between Christ's conception of *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, and that of the Jews around him, was not in the conception of the life itself, but in that of the Divine rule to which the Christian must submit himself, and the 'righteousness' he must possess before he can gain the life.

IV. *The World.*—Old Testament Hebrew has no expression quite equivalent to the Greek *ὁ κόσμος*, and the use of עוֹלָם with this meaning in pre-Christian times must be gravely doubted. In the Synoptics there is only one instance in which the word *κόσμος* occurs in all the parallel passages, and that is in the phrase, 'to gain the whole world' (Mat 16^{26}, || Mk 8^{36}, || Lk 9^{25}). If *κόσμος* occurs in one Gospel we usually find *κτίσις* or *ἡ οἰκουμένη* in the other. The Gospel of John uses the word frequently, and it is very common in Palestinian literature towards the close of the first century. How the word עוֹלָם took upon itself a *local* significance is difficult to know. Dalman rejects the authenticity of the saying in Pirke Aboth, assigned to Simeon the Just (fl. 280 B.C.), that '*the world* (הָעוֹלָם) rests on three things: the law, the ritual-service, and the bestowal of kindnesses'; but he is less decided whether Shammai may not have been the author of the statement ascribed to him in Eduyoth, i. 13: 'The *world* was created only for being fruitful and multiplying.' In Mat 19^{28} we have the phrase *ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ* = 'in the regeneration'; for which the parallel passage (Lk 22^{30}) gives 'in my kingdom.' The Syriac versions render this, 'in the *new world*,' or '*æon*': and this, most probably, was the original Aramaic. Eleazar of Modiim (100 A.D.) speaks of 'the new world,' and the Targum of Onkelos on Dt 32^{12} speaks of 'the world which He is about to renew.' Jewish literature also knows of the conception of 'a new creation' in Enoch 72^{1}, Jubilees 1^{29}, and 4 Ezr 7^{75}. The Midrash uses the phrase 'a new creature' of the one who repents of his sin on the day of atonement; but, in my judgment, this is a

phrase borrowed from Christianity. We have no early evidence of its use.

VI. *The Father in Heaven.*—Professor Dalman holds that Jesus derived this designation of God from common usage; the evidence adduced being as follows:—In Ecclus 23^4 we have the phrase, 'O Lord, Father, and God of my life.' Jubilees 1^{24} emphasizes the fatherly relation of God towards Israel. In Tob 13^4 we read, 'He is our God and our Father,' and in Enoch 62^{11} pious Israelites are called 'His sons.' The earliest clear evidences for the phrase are a saying of Simeon Ben Jochai (130 A.D.): 'Over a wise son not only does his father who is on earth rejoice, but also his Father who is in heaven'; and a saying of Gamaliel II. (100 A.D.): 'Since the beloved children provoked their Father who is in heaven, he put over them a king.' In the fifth and sixth prayers of the Eighteen Prayers formulated about 110 A.D., Israel, in seeking for pardon, addresses God as 'Our Father,' and Akiba (120 A.D.) once prayed for rain with a short prayer beginning 'Our Father and our King.' The word Ἀββᾶ in the N.T. is the determinative form, and yet may be used for 'my Father' and 'our Father.'

VII. *Other designations for God.*—The Mishna scrupulously avoids the use of the word 'God,' except in citations from the O.T., and Dalman thinks it 'remarkable that ὁ Θεός in all the Gospels is found on the lips of Jesus.' But is it so? Did not Jesus come to give us a new revelation of God as entering into loving fellowship with men, and would He not wish to rebuke the superstition which shrunk from using the name of God? Pious substitutes for the name of God among the Jews were: (1) the Most High (Lk 6^{35}), (2) the Blessed (Mk 14^{61}), (3) the Power (Mat 26^{64}), (4) the Holy One (1 P 1^{15}), (5) the Merciful (Ecclus 50^{19}), (6) Heaven (Lu 15^{18}).

IX. *The Son of Man.*—This was not a popular Jewish name for the Messiah, as is evident from the question asked by the Jews in Jn 12^{34}, 'Who is this Son of Man?' This was the reason why Christ adopted the name, because He wished to conceal His Messiahship at the outset, and yet to appropriate a name which in a few passages in previous literature signified, as He was conscious, none but Himself. The chief passage is Da 7^{13}: 'There came with the clouds of heaven (one) like a Son of Man' (כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ). It would, I venture to think, simplify this passage very much if we might deem this 'the *Kaph veritatis*': 'a veritable, real Son of Man' (cf. Is 13^6 29^2, Ezk 26^{10}). I do not remember to have met with the usage of כְּ in Aramaic, but if Dalman could adduce more *proof* that Da 7 has been translated into Aramaic out of Hebrew, then we might with confidence assign to כְּ its Hebrew significance. In the Book of Enoch, with which our Lord was probably familiar, the title 'Son of Man' is used to indicate the mysterious greatness of the supernatural being who never was upon earth and yet is not God. Jesus used the name to assert His claim to be the One whom Daniel spoke of, and *also*, in probable antithesis to the phrase Son of God, to indicate that He was 'the frail child of men whom God will make Lord of the world' in allusion to Ps 8^5.

We must not now trespass further by giving the results of Dalman's exposition of the phrases 'Son of God,' 'Christ,' and 'Son of David.' They are discussed with the same thoroughness as the rest. In each case our author examines the use of the phrase in Jewish writings, and compares it with the use of the same in the Gospels, giving clear expositions of the Semitic words which lie behind both. The charm of the book is not so much in the *new* citations which the author exhumes from Jewish literature. The student of Gfrörer, Weber, Stapfer, Wünsche, and Edersheim has met with most of them before. The value of the book is that—(1) with an unprecedented knowledge of Aramaic, Professor Dalman has gone direct to original sources, and one can rely absolutely on the accuracy of the translations; (2) he pays great attention to remedy what one has so often deplored in Weber, *i.e.* indifference to chronology in citing Jewish Rabbis. We wish to know the state of Jewish theology in the first Christian century, and Dalman never names a Rabbi without affixing the time at which he lived; (3) there is a masterly freshness in the way in which Jewish and Christian conceptions are compared. When the work is complete (this is marked as vol. i.), it seems likely to supersede all previous works as a reliable storehouse of Jewish theology.

We must not omit to state that Professor Dalman appends to his work a list of Messianic passages in the original, culled from Jewish literature. This may be had separately.

J. T. Marshall.

Manchester.

Among the Periodicals.

The Parable of the Vineyard in Isa. v. 1-7.

In the *Revue Biblique* of January last, Professor Cersoy of Lyons has an interesting study of Is 5^{1-7}. He deals with (1) the prelude, (2) the literary structure of the passage, (3) the LXX version of it. We shall speak only of the first two of these points.

(1) The opening verse is usually rendered (as in A.V.) 'I will sing to (or, as in R.V.m. 'of') my beloved (*lîdîdî*) a song of my beloved (*shîrath dôdî*) touching his vineyard.' But, as Cersoy points out, there are serious objections to this rendering, although it is faithful to the Massoretic text. There is something unnatural and awkward in the notion of singing a song of the kind in question *to* its author. On the other hand, this objection is only partially evaded by rendering 'of *or* concerning my beloved,' while, further, what follows is *not* 'a song of my beloved.' On the contrary, it commences '*My beloved had* a vine,' etc. The author of a song could not have spoken of himself in this form. In other words, *dôd* and *yâdîd* do not designate one and the same person. *Dôd* in the Old Testament, besides meaning 'beloved' (as in Canticles *passim*), has the sense of 'uncle' (paternal), *e.g.* Lv 10^4 20^{20}, 1 S $10^{14.\ 15.\ 16}$, etc. Suppose we try this rendering here: 'I am to sing to (*or* touching) my beloved the song of my uncle about his vineyard.' This would certainly avoid the difficulties encountered when *dôd* and *yâdîd* are identified. But it is opposed by the circumstance that the opening words of the parable '*My beloved* (*yâdîd*) had,' etc., cannot be uttered except by the speaker to whom we owe the preceding 'I am to sing to (*or* touching) *my beloved* (*yâdîd*),' etc.

The conclusion from all this is clear to Cersoy, that in *dôd* we have no third person at all, the speaker and his friend the owner of the vineyard being the only two persons in view. What then? We must have to do with the word *dôdîm* 'love,' which is found only in the plural. Lowth adopted this reading and rendered 'a lovely song,' remarking that 'thus we avoid the great impropriety of making the author of the song and the person to whom it is addressed to be the same.' Lowth is followed in this by Cheyne (*The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 1884), and *Isaiah*, in the 'Polychrome Bible' ['a love song']. All that is necessary to justify it is to suppose that a final *m* has dropped out of the Massor. text, so that we have now *dôdî* instead of an original *dôdîm*. Cersoy suggests a still simpler emendation, the substitution of the Heb. vowel *pathaḥ* for *ḥîreq*, thus giving rise to *dôdai* instead of *dôdî*. He thus obtains the rendering 'I am to sing to my beloved *my* love song' ('Je vais chanter à mon ami mon chant amical').

(2) The parable falls into four divisions. In the first of these (vv.$^{1b.\ 2}$), which is in verse, the trouble taken by the owner of the vineyard and the ill recompense of his pains form the subject, which is unfolded in a way calculated, like many of our Lord's parables, to enlist the attention of the auditory, without at once awakening their suspicions regarding its application. Secondly, the owner of the vineyard, without any introduction, speaks directly (vv.$^{3.\ 4}$), appealing to Jerusalem and the inhabitants of Judah to say what more he could have done for his vineyard. Thirdly, the owner announces the vengeance he is to take (vv.$^{5.\ 6}$). It has been growing always more clear that no ordinary vineyard and no ordinary owner are in view, so that the way is now completely paved for the fourth stage (v.^{7}), where the prophet takes up the word and roundly declares, 'The vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel,' etc. He might have gone on to speak of the coming chastisements, but he leaves his hearers to draw the conclusion for themselves.

Müller's 'Prophets in their Original Form.'

In The Expository Times for June 1897 (pp. 413 ff.) an account was given of Professor D. H. Müller's work, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*. The views contended for by this author are examined by Professor Kautzsch in *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1899, Heft ii. pp. 307 ff.

The aim of Professor Müller was nothing less than to trace a fundamental inner connexion between the poetical structure exhibited in Biblical writings (not only in the Old Testament, but *e.g.* in Mat 6 and 7), in the cuneiform texts, in the Koran, and in the choruses of the Greek tragedians. In particular, to use the language of Mr. G. G. Bagster, 'he endeavours to prove that the Hebrew prophets used strophes like those employed in the choruses of the Greek drama, with strophe and antistrophe answering one another, yet displaying conceptive unity, perfect consonance, or else similarity of sound, while a certain rhythm supplies the

place of the strict Greek metre. It was this law of antiphony in the Hebrew text, the answering of strophe and antistrophe, which, the author says, led him to the discovery of the original, prophetic, and poetic form.'

The theory of Professor Müller has had a mixed reception. The proposition to establish a connexion between elements so disparate as those above enumerated appears to many so monstrous that they deem themselves absolved from the task of examining the arguments offered in support of it. Others have examined these, and pronounced an emphatic condemnation on the theory. Some again have been not only convinced by Professor Müller, but have been so carried away by enthusiasm for his alleged discovery that they speak of his book as 'epoch making,' and cannot estimate too highly its significance for the history of literature and even of ethnology. In view of such a conflict of opinion, our readers will be glad to hear what is the judgment pronounced by so competent an authority as Professor Kautzsch.

The starting-point of Müller's alleged discovery was Ezk 14^{12-23} 16 f., and especially chs. 19 and 21. The phenomena observed there were then traced throughout Ezk, discovered also in Am 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, Jer $1^{11ff.}$, Is 1, etc., and not only there, but in Zimmern's translation of the Babylonian Creation epos, and very markedly in different passages of the Koran. The essential mark in all these instances is the strophe structure and the antiphony ('Responsion'), *i.e.* the correspondence also of ideas between different strophes, which is often marked by the use of the same or similarly sounding words. To quote Müller's own words, 'What the *parallelismus membrorum* is in verse, such is the "Responsion" in the strophe and in the language.' Besides this, the æsthetic effect is heightened by the 'Concatenatio' and the 'Inclusio.' By the first of these terms is meant 'the connecting of the two strophic organisms by a bond in the ideas or in the form,' while the 'Inclusio' is the separating barrier from the neighbouring organism, that which gives its individual character to a strophe.

Professor Kautzsch confesses that hitherto he has always been very sceptical of all strophe theories and of most theories of rhythm in Hebrew poetry. Nor has his scepticism yielded to the arguments of Professor Müller. At the same time he readily admits that the latter has brought many valuable facts to light. Apart from such clear cases as Am 1 f., 7 f., Is $9^{7ff.}$, Ps 39, 42 f., 46, etc., with their regularly recurring refrain, Müller appears to him to have established, or at least made very probable, the presence of a similar structure in a number of other passages (for the Koran passages see Kautzsch's article). It is also worth considering whether Müller's alterations on the Massoretic text, although made in the interest of his theory, are not in some instances worthy of being accepted.

Müller has recently published a set of *Neue Beiträge* in support of his theory. These are drawn from the Song of Deborah, eight passages from the prophetical books, a number of Psalms, some chapters of Proverbs, Job, Lamentations, Sirach (chs. 39–42, the recently recovered Hebrew text, in which a considerable number of ten-lined strophes are discovered by Müller). Professor Kautzsch examines at length Müller's analysis of Ps 119, for the details of which it is only fair to refer Old Testament students to the article in *Studien u. Kritiken*.

It may be noted here, that the same number of the last-named periodical contains, amongst other items of importance, an elaborate article by Ley on the 'Ebed-Jahweh' of Deutero-Isaiah (which will be found carefully criticised in Professor König's forthcoming English work), and one by Resch on the Hebrew 'Testament of Naphtali.'

Demonology, Magic, etc.

In the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* (Nos. 4 and 5 of the present year) Professor Schürer notices a number of recent works on the above subjects. As the bearing of the ancient beliefs in these is of the utmost importance for the understanding of a good deal both of the Old Testament and the New, it may be of service to some readers to have the benefit of Schürer's guidance in regard to the literature. In the recently published third edition of that author's *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, the section dealing with magical formulæ and books (vol. iii. pp. 294–304) has been materially enlarged, and he has evidently made a special study of all recent publications in the same department.

1. Last year appeared a German translation of Lehmann's originally (1893) Danish work entitled *Aberglaube und Zauberei von den ältesten Zeiten an bis in die Gegenwart*. The primary aim of the writer is to explain the phenomena of modern

spiritualism and kindred superstitions, but he judges rightly that a psychological explanation will have far more force if preceded by a historical. Hence he gives the results of a very full examination of the beliefs in question, from the earliest times down to the present day. He distinguishes three leading forms of superstition and magic, which he traces to three main sources: (1) the popular form of belief in spirits and in magic, originating especially among the Chaldeans, proceeding from them to the Greeks and Romans, establishing itself in the Christian Church, and finally giving rise to the belief in witchcraft and to the persecution of witches; (2) the scientific Cabalistic form is of mixed Jewish-Egyptian-Arabic origin, and reached Europe through the Moors; (3) the third form is modern spiritualism, with its tinge of natural science, a belief introduced from America into Europe about the middle of the present century. Only a small quantum of the superstitious notions which have prevailed in our quarter of the world have had their original home among the European nations.

The above scheme, Schürer thinks, can be adopted only with very considerable modifications. Lehmann himself supplies a fundamental correction to it in what he says on 'Superstition and Magic among the savage nations,' and on 'the Northmen and Finns.' The influence of the Chaldees on Græco-Roman antiquity, great as it undoubtedly was, appears to Schürer to be exaggerated by Lehmann. A more comprehensive examination of the data would show, he thinks, that the belief in spirits and the magic connected therewith is to be found amongst all nations at the primitive stage of their religious beliefs and practices, and tends to survive even after a higher form of religion has gained a footing. Both amongst the Jews and the Greeks these superstitions are believed by Schürer to be considerably older than Lehmann supposes. But in general the work under review is warmly commended to all students of this obscure subject.

2. J. Weiss's articles 'Dämonen' and 'Dämonische' in the new edition of Herzog, are commended as supplying rich materials, and presenting these in the proper light for the study of the history of religion.

3. A special welcome is accorded by Schürer to Blau's *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, because it takes careful account of the little accessible Rabbinical material. By '*altjüdisch*' the author understands the Talmudic period, say roughly, about the first 500 years of our era. In addition, however, to Rabbinical sources, he uses also the Greek magical papyri, which have for the most part become accessible in quite recent times. These are not, of course, Jewish, but they witness more or less to strong Jewish influences. After an introduction dealing with the belief in demons, and with magic in general, Blau treats of the prevalence of magic among the Jews. This he takes to have been extensive, and women are shown to have played an important rôle in connexion with it. He believes that it was introduced mainly from Egypt, which he holds to have been the special home of magic, as Babylonia was of astrology and soothsaying. On this last point Schürer joins issue with him, holding that all the evidence goes to show that in magical arts Babylonia could at least hold its own with Egypt. Blau goes on to speak of the 'aims and efficacy of magic' and its 'methods.' A preliminary question appears to Schürer to be this, On whom or what (God, the demons, the souls of the dead, animals, natural objects viewed as animated) is the magical influence meant to be exerted? The want of any special treatment of this question appears to him to leave a *lacuna* in Blau's treatise. Of methods, the most efficacious was the employment of the unutterable Divine name. Other formulæ and practices are described in a way that leaves little to be desired.

4. Wünsch in his *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom* has deciphered—a very difficult task—a number of lead tablets, or fragments of such, discovered at Rome in the year 1850. Some of the texts are in Latin, some in Greek, and along with them there are frequently figures scratched on the lead,—notably there occurs a figure with a human body and an ass's head. The texts are composed of imprecations intended to prevent the victory of a rival in the chariot race in the circus, for which noble end, as Schürer remarks, the demons are invoked to check and to damage the opponent and his horses. The date of the tablets is probably 390–420 A.D. The deities invoked are principally Egyptian, especially Osiris and Seth-Typhon. Wünsch here introduces what Schürer considers to be a very precarious notion about the connexion of these tablets with the Gnostic sect of the Sethians.

5. In his *Das Reich Gottes und die Dämonen*

in der alten Kirche, K. Müller shows admirably what immense influence the belief in demons exercised over the notions that prevailed in the early Church. So much so, that in many circles the redemption wrought by Christ was viewed as pre-eminently a deliverance from the power of the demons, a notion which, with certain modifications, still lingers on in many quarters.

6. Mr. Conybeare contributed to the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (vol. xi. 1898–99) a translation into English of the 'Testament of Solomon.' In this we are told how Solomon, at the building of the temple, summoned one after another of the most diverse demons, and gave them their work to do in the building. Schürer sees no ground for Conybeare's opinion that the present text is the Christian revision of a Jewish original, which was used by the Ophites. He commends warmly Conybeare's former articles on 'Christian demonology' in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, viii. (1896), pp. 576 ff.; ix. (1897), pp. 59 ff., 444 ff., 581 ff.

7. Finally comes Professor T. Witton Davies's *Magic: Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and their neighbours*. On this Schürer pronounces a rather qualified judgment, finding that both the arrangement and the treatment of the subject leave a good deal to be desired. His unfavourable judgment does not, however, affect the part of the book devoted to the Old Testament, where he finds all the essential data gathered and handled scientifically, while the author's thorough acquaintance with the literature (including the German authorities) on the subject is conspicuous.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Contributions and Comments.

The Wells of Beersheba.

Three years ago I published in the *Revue Chrétienne* of Paris (April 1896, p. 295) an account of the visit I had made in February 1894 to the old wells of Beersheba. Your contributor, Mr. Selbie, noticed that article, and mentioned it in The Expository Times of July 1896 (p. 472). Professor Driver and Dr. Trumbull wrote on the same subject in The Expository Times of September 1896 (pp. 567, 568) and of November 1896 (p. 89). I may also refer to my book, *Souvenirs de Terre-Sainte* (2nd ed. 1898, p. 148).

Canon Driver's conclusion was: 'Perhaps future visitors to Beersheba will direct their attention to this point, and endeavour to number the wells and measure the distances between them more accurately.' In a letter to myself, the learned professor wrote: 'There is room for a more accurate description of the wells and determination of their number; and it is to be hoped that some traveller may before long give it to us.'

I enjoy now the privilege of being the traveller hoped for by Dr. Driver. Sojourning for the second time in the Holy Land, I of course arranged to visit Beersheba again, and went there last Tuesday, 28th February, with my friend, Dr. Paterson of Hebron. We stayed there from 11.15 a.m. till the following morning (in 1894 I had arrived at sunset, and left shortly after sunrise). We measured accurately the wells, and inquired carefully about their number.

These are the results—

	Width (Diameter).			Depth.		
	Metres.	Cm.	Ft. In.	Metres.	Cm.	Ft. In.
Western well . .	1	65 =	5 $4\frac{8}{10}$	13	60 =	44 $7\frac{5}{10}$
Middle ,, . .	3	80 =	12 $5\frac{6}{10}$	12	66 =	41 $6\frac{38}{100}$
Eastern ,, . .	2	72 =	8 11	14	72 =	48 $3\frac{48}{100}$

The distance from the western well to the middle well is 254 metres 45 cm. = 834 ft. 6 in., and from the middle well to the eastern well, 214 metres 20 cm. = 702 ft. 9 in.

The eastern well and the middle well are exactly east-west from each other. The western well is a little more south than the middle well, by 10 degrees.

Beersheba is no more the solitary and poetical place it was five years ago, as I have described it in my above-mentioned book. An enterprising sheikh of the Bedouins, Suweilim-Ibn-Arfân es-Sâkhinî, belonging to the mighty tribe of the 'Azâzimeh, has started business in Beersheba, and built two *sâqiyeh's* above the eastern and the middle wells (the eastern one in July 1897, and the middle one

in December 1897); these are vaults of stone masonry, with a hole and a roll just above the mouth of the well, and large troughs for the cattle. He has also built (in June 1898) a small *khân*, situated a little way north from the middle well. A tradesman from Gaza lives there with his family and servants, and provides the Bedouins with different sorts of goods. The Sheikh Suweilim was himself present on Tuesday. Thus we were able to speak with him and with several other men (in style the place was entirely desert), and to inquire about the possible existence of other wells mentioned by some travellers and scholars. The emphatic answer was there are not and have not been other wells than the three existing ones since at least one century. And, in fact, we have not been able to discover any remains of other wells in the neighbourhood. However, between the eastern and the middle wells there are remains of an old building, which is supposed to have been a bath, and there has been discovered a wall made of bricks, which might have belonged to an oven. Beside this building, a place was shown to us, a round place with a small depression and green grass on it, and it is not impossible that there may have been a well there, but there is nothing left of it.

I think, therefore, that the question of the number of the wells may be considered as settled, at least as far as our century is concerned.

I wish to mention that, whereas five years ago the eastern well was dry and empty, and the middle well muddy; now the three wells are in the best condition, and contain excellent water. Of course, the Bedouins who come to the wells with their herds must now pay for the water, and so we have here an example of a Bedouin sheikh speculating on the old wells of Abraham! *O tempora, O mores!*

LUCIEN GAUTIER
(*Geneva, Switzerland*).

Jerusalem, 4th March 1899.

A New Divine Name in the Old Testament.

Hos 5^{11} reads in A.V. 'Ephraim is oppressed and broken in judgment, because he willingly walked after the commandment' (צו). R.V. changes this to 'Ephraim is oppressed, he is crushed in judgment; because he was content to walk after the command' (with note in the margin: 'The Sept. and Syriac have *vanity*').

After the expression הָלַךְ אַחֲרֵי we should clearly expect the name of a god. Even the LXX, with its *ὀπίσω τῶν ματαίων* (שָׁוְא, instead of the M.T. צָו), evidently took צו, which was unintelligible to the Greek translator, for a hidden divine name, and therefore substituted שָׁוְא. Cf., for the expression הָלַךְ אַחֲרֵי, Dt 4^{3} (Baal-peor), Jg 2^{19} ('other gods,' אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים), and similar passages.

But, now, there was a Semitic god צו, as is proved by the Palmyrene proper names, אמתצא ('handmaid of Ẓa'u'), חימצא ('gift of Za'u'), and, above all, עבדצו ('servant of Zau'); cf. the citations in *PSBA*, xxi. (1899), p. 75. But I am able to contribute further information about this deity, who manifestly represents the rays of the moon (cf. Arab. *ḍau'* = 'light'). In a photograph of a S. Arabian (Katabanian) inscription recently sent to Europe by a Greek merchant, Mr. Joannis Kallisporis, and which I intend to publish in the *ZDMG*, vol. 53, we find, *inter alia*, the words—

במחרצו ומישרקיתן

i.e. bî-maḥâr Ḍaww (for *Ḍau'*) *wa-mashraḳîyatân* = 'by the grace of Ḍaww and the goddess of the East.' As we learn from another inscription (Dérenbourg, *Bibl. Nat.* No. 1, lines 2 and 3), the goddess of the East is the sun (always conceived of by the Arabs as feminine). Hence the previously named Ḍaww will be either the morning star (*Athtar*), or, as general analogy makes still more probable, the moon-god. The inscription (*Bibl. Nat.* No. 1) commences: ערבם עבד בן הדרום הקני שמסהמו משרקיתן צלמן דדהבן, "Arab, slave of the banû Hadurâw (*or* Had-rawwam [? Hadd-rôm], then parallel with הֲדוֹרָם of Gn 10^{27}) has dedicated to their sun-goddess of the East this statue of gold.'

It is certain, then, that Hos 5^{11} ought to be rendered 'because Ephraim followed willingly the god Ẓaw.' The worship of the moon's light (in distinction from the moon pure and simple), or of the *ḍau'*, prevailed in ancient times from S. Arabia to the Syro-Arabian desert, so that it is no wonder to find this deity worshipped in the northern kingdom of Israel, which was character-

ized by syncretism in idolatry, and was specially devoted to the star-cult. It is an interesting circumstance that the etymologically corresponding word in Arabic, *ḍau'*, is always used in ancient Arabic poetry of a brightness appearing *by night*, whether of fire (Imrulḳeis xvi. 1, 'Urwa iii. 18, Labid vi. 6), or lightning (Imrulḳeis xx. 56), or the stars (*ib.* iv. 18), or the full moon (*ib.* xxix. 12), but not of the brilliant daystar, the sun, except when the reference is to the morning dawn struggling forth from the darkness of night (so, *e.g.*, Mu'all. Harith ver. 8, or Hudh. xvi. 18: *ḍiyâ'* and the verb *aḍâ'a*).

One sees, moreover, from the once so obscure passage, Hos 5^{11}, and the surprising light that is thrown upon it by Oriental archæological discovery, how ill-advised it is in such instances to have recourse to all manner of conjectures and textual emendations, and how it is simply our ignorance of an ancient custom or of the lost meaning of a word that frequently prevents exegetes from understanding the text which in general is correct or only slightly corrupt. I knew well what I was about, when two years ago, upon the idyllic shores of the Lago di Garda, I wrote in the preface to the English edition of my *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* these words: '"External evidence" must be the banner under which all students of Old Testament literature are to range themselves in the future.'

And yet how fragmentary, after all, is the whole of our knowledge of the ancient East! But at least the numerous extant fragments, whether in the shape of S. Arabian or Palmyrene, or Nabatæan, or (side by side with the S. Arabian, most important of all) Babylono-Assyrian inscriptions, must in future be the chief weapons of the Old Testament exegete. Unfortunately, my constant insistence upon this has gained for me the ill-will of that whole class, and it is for the same reason that an absolutely unjust judgment has been passed upon my book, as if, in spite of many additions to Old Testament knowledge contained in it, I knew nothing about Old Testament critical methods. I know the latter from long decades of study only too well; but because I have striven to direct them into new ways, and because I regard them as resting on weak foundations, nay, in great part on no foundation at all—*hinc ille furor*.

Finally, with reference to the early *moon-cult* (confirmed afresh by the above צו) of the Western Semites, which plays so important a rôle also in the early history of the people of Israel, I would refer meanwhile to the article by G. Margoliouth in the *Contemp. Review*, October 1898, and to my own former notes in The Expository Times (October and December 1898).

Fritz Hommel.

Munich.

On 1 Kings x. 25; Job xli. 19; Neh. iii. 19, and other Passages.

Mr. Stanley A. Cook's valuable note in The Expository Times for March (pp. 279 ff.) has enabled me to get farther in some researches on the group of passages referred to. His insight into text-critical problems is equalled by the ingenuity of the solutions which he proposes. He may or may not, upon consideration, assent to my general conclusion. I hope, indeed, that he may do so; but even if not, he will probably be able to dovetail some of my details into his own critical structure. I pay him the greatest compliment I can in taking his suggestions so seriously. I am not at all shocked at his real or supposed discovery of Assyrian words in old Hebrew documents; I have, in fact, lately found one in a quite recent Hebrew work (Is 33^{18}; see *Isaiah*, in Haupt's Hebrew Bible, *ad loc.*). I believe, too, that he is right in the present instance in looking for light to Assyrian; but I venture to think that he has not selected the right Assyrian word. But before I go into this point, I have to refer to the passages in which the word נשק apparently occurs. It is important to begin in this way; this is a question of method. Mr. Cook remarks that נשק is correctly recognized by 𝔊 in 2 K 10^{2}, Ezk $39^{9f.}$ (τὰ ὅπλα), cf. Ps 140^{8} (πολέμου), but that it seems to be misunderstood in Is 22^{8}, while in Job 20^{24} 39^{21} 𝔐 may perhaps be corrupt. Let us start here: (*a*) Job 20^{24}. 𝔐 has מנשק ברזל; 𝔊 ἐκ χειρὸς σιδήρου. 𝔊 as it stands cannot give the poet's meaning aright. ברזל might indeed mean an iron weapon (Job 41^{19}), but the parallel line requires a word for some special weapon preceding ברזל. 𝔊's true text no doubt gave μαχαίρας for χειρός; even Beer has overlooked this. The right Hebrew word is שַׁלַּח; transposition and quite natural corruption will account for the

faulty reading נשק. See Job 33^{18}, where 𝔐 has בַּשָּׁלַח, but 𝔊 *ἐν πολέμῳ*, *i.e.*, probably, בַּנֶּשֶׁק (cf. *πολέμου* for נשק in Ps 140^{8}). (*b*) Job 39^{21}. 𝔐 has יֵצֵא לִקְרַאת־נָשֶׁק, 'he goes out against the armour' (Duhm), or 'to face the conflict' (Budde). Duhm's rendering is in some degree defensible. But לקראת leads us to expect something more distinctly offensive than 'armour,' such as 'bow,' 'sword,' 'warriors,' or the like. 𝔊's text is overgrown, but it is obvious that לק'־נ corresponds to *συναντῶν βασιλεῖ*, *i.e.* לִקְרַאת־מֶלֶךְ. מלך may possibly be right; but much more probably we should read שָׁלַח; 𝔊, however, is at least a witness to ל. (*c*) Is 22^{8}, אֶל־נֶשֶׁק בֵּית הַיַּעַר, Dillmann-Kittel, 'to the (store of) arms in the forest-house' (*i.e.* the arsenal). But this reference does not come in quite naturally before 'Ye saw the breaches of the city of David.' 𝔊 has *εἰς τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οἴκους τῆς πόλεως*. It is plain that 𝔊's text was corrupt, like our own (𝔐), but it was not quite so remote from truth. How shall we proceed? Looking on, we notice an accumulation of clauses which are more like an extract from a prosaic official report than the impassioned utterance of a prophet. Now let us take a hint from 𝔊. בָּתֵּי הָעִיר is preferable to בֵּית הַיַּעַר, and yet not quite right. The clause in v.^{8b} corresponds to v.^{10a}, and should be corrected thus, וַתִּסְפֹּר אֶת־בָּתֵּי יְרוּשָׁלַם. היער is a corruption of שלם, ירו of אלנש. ק is due to a scribe's reasoning on the dislocated letters before him, and the unimportant את has dropped out. (*d*) Ezk $39^{9f.}$, בְּנֶשֶׁק וּמָגֵן וְצִנָּה, and כִּי בַנֶּשֶׁק יִבְעֲרוּ־אֵשׁ. 𝔊 gives *ὅπλα* for נשק. Mr. Cook, however, explains נ' here, 'a wooden chariot,' because wooden chariots would be more inflammable than weapons. This is not a very strong reason. The true reading, I should say, must be רְכֻשׁ, 'movable property,'—a large, comprehensive term. Now we can see why, in v.^{10}, exclusive reference is made to the first of the items mentioned in v.^{9}. It is the property of Gog and his army which is naturally the chief 'spoil' of the Israelites (note בזז and שלל, and cf. Da 11^{24}). (*e*) Ps 140^{a}, בְּיוֹם נָשֶׁק, 'on the day of armour' (Bäthgen). Very odd indeed. 𝔊 𝔍 𝔗 paraphrases 'in the day of war.' Read certainly מִפּוּשְׁבֵי בְקֶשֶׁת (1 K 22^{34}). (*f*) Neh 3^{19}, מִמְּגִנֵּד עֲלֵת הַנֶּשֶׁק הַמִּקְצֹעַ; 𝔊 *τῆς συναπτούσης τῆς γωνίας* (BA), or *εἰς τὴν γωνίαν* (Luc.). Mr. Cook would read מִמְּגִנֵּד הַנֶּשֶׁק, which he renders 'in front of the armoury,' נֶשֶׁק being taken (as by most) as the short for בֵּית הַנֶּשֶׁק. I am not clear about the passage as a whole, but I believe that if 'armoury' had been meant, the writer would have said בֵּית הַכֵּלִים (Is 39^{2}). I incline to read הַנֶּשֶׁק לַמִּקְצֹעַ, which may have been 𝔊's reading (cf. Luc.), נשק II., as in Ps 85^{11} (?). At anyrate the breakdown of the evidence for נֶשֶׁק or נֶשֶׁק, 'armour,' is so complete elsewhere that it is not prudent to adopt it here, where certainly nothing in the context suggests it. (*g*) Now we come to 1 K 10^{25}, 2 Ch 9^{24}, 'vessels of silver and of gold, and garments, and נשק, and spices, horses, and mules.' To 𝔐's נשק *στακτή* is apparently the corresponding word in 𝔊 (BALuc.). Mr. Cook is excellent in his treatment of this strange word. He is probably right, I think, in taking it to represent, in reality, not נשק but כֹּר. Then he finds Pesh. and Jos. both giving 'chariots' between 'horses and mules,' and very ingeniously he pleads for the view that between סוסים and ופרדים the original text gave וּמֶרְנְשָׁקִים, *i.e.* the Assyr. *mûrniskē*, 'horses' (Frd. Del. *Ass. HWB*), or perhaps (this is his conjecture) chariot-horses or litter-horses. I should like to accept this, but I do not think it very probable. מר, which 𝔊 probably read where 𝔐 reads נשק, appears to me to be a dittogram of מות in the preceding word שלמות. I agree with Mr. Cook, however, that the problematic word before us means some kind of animal; with him, I place it between סוסים and ופרדים. The question is, Can we find in the Hebrew or the Assyrian dictionary any word which, by corruption, could become נשק, and might fitly occupy the suggested place? I think we can. Dr. Paul Ruben has, most ingeniously and convincingly, proposed to correct בְּמֶחִיר in that difficult passage 1 K 10^{28} into בַּפֶּחִיר; cf. Assyr. *suḫîru*, 'the young of some animal,' such as the horse (Del. *Ass. HWB*, 173, 496). He reads, 'and fifty pieces of silver they paid for the סחיר to the merchants of the Hittites and the merchants of Syria, by whom they (the animals) were exported' (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1898, p. 543). נ and ר being phonetically akin, סחיר may have become corrupted into סחין, and this, by accidental transposition (a fruitful source of error), and the confusion of ח and ק, ס and ש, may easily have become [נשק(ם] or נשק. סחיר

would, by an obvious conjecture, become מרכבות, 'chariots,' the reading of Pesh. and Jos.; G perhaps passed over מחיר as unintelligible.

I have limited myself to that part of Mr. Cook's note which refers to נשך. Like the late Professor Robertson Smith, I think that all who have any contributions to make to the study of Hebrew words should make them. Biblical theology depends in no small degree on grammatical and lexicographical studies. T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

Professor Sayce and Recent Archaeological Discoveries.

I SEE that, with my usual inability to correct my own proofs, I have allowed two misprints to pass unnoticed in my review of Mr. King's book (p. 268). 'Just published,' col 1, line 14, should be 'first published; and in col. 2, line 12, the word 'and' has dropped out before 'the county of Situllum.'

I do not understand what Mr. Selbie means by saying (p. 279) that 'a considerable gap is made in [my] *Early History of the Hebrews* by the discovery of the real contents of Dr. Scheil's Deluge tablet.' The tablet is not even referred to in the text or index of that book; it is mentioned only in the Preface, where it serves to illustrate the accuracy (not of the Old Testament, but) of the Babylonian and Syrian scribes. The antiquity of the Gilgames text of the Chaldean account of the Deluge has been known for nearly thirty years. Dr. Scheil's discovery goes to show that the antiquity of the other text, which George Smith erroneously supposed to form part of the Gilgames text, is quite as great. But I have not even alluded to the latter in the text of my book, much less to Dr. Scheil's discovery. Where, therefore, does the 'collapse' come in?

A. H. SAYCE.

Luxor, 7th March 1899.

The Crown of Life.

I HAVE been intensely interested in the two papers which have appeared on this subject in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. There appears, however, to be more truth in the connotation of the term στέφανος as given by the Rev. W. Ernest Beet than the Rev. J. H. Morrison would have us believe. The point in Mr. Beet's communication seems to be that 'the essential element of the connotation of the term στέφανος . . . is that of successful achievement, and not, as the English word immediately suggests to our minds, the royal rank of the wearer.'

I have carefully examined the eighteen instances in which στέφανος occurs in the N.T., and am forced to the conclusion that the writers had the idea of victory or successful achievement in mind, for this best accords with the context in each case.

Trench in his work on *N.T. Synonyms*, speaking of the N.T. use of the term, holds that the only occasion on which it might seem to be used of a kingly crown is Mat 27^{29}; cf. Mk 15^{17}, Jn $19^{2.5}$. Mr. Morrison would lead us to believe that John himself did not think of successful achievement, but rather of the diadem of the sovereign, when he uses the term literally, but Rev 6^2 9^7 and 14^{14} unmistakably prove it otherwise, and to me it seems that the idea of victory best accords with the remaining three instances (viz. Rev 4^4 4^{10} and 12^1). Even the 'crown of thorns,' according to Meyer, was the caricature of the bay-crown, as the reed was of the sceptre. Alford tells us that Hasselquist, a Swedish naturalist, held that it was made of 'a very common plant, *naba* or *nubka*, of the Arabs, with many small and sharp spines; soft, round, and pliant branches; leaves much resembling ivy, of a very deep green, as if in designed mockery of a victor's wreath.'

Dr. Purves in the new *Dictionary of the Bible* rightly concludes that στέφανος in the N.T. 'is an emblem of victory or reward. It describes the Christian's final recompense (1 Co 9^{25}, Rev 3^{11} $4^{4.10}$), specifically called a crown of righteousness (2 Ti 4^8), of life (Ja 1^{12}, Rev 2^{10}), of glory (1 P 5^4). St. Paul applies it to his converts as being his reward (Ph 4^1, 1 Th 2^{19}). Hence in the Apocalypse a crown is represented on the conquering Christ (Rev 6^2 14^{14}), on the symbolic locusts (Rev 9^7), and on the "woman" of chap. 12, as a sign of victory. . . . Thus *crown* in N.T. is the emblem of attainment, the reward of service. Even the "crown of thorns" was probably a mock symbol of victory, suggested to the soldiers by the *coronae* of military or civic service.'

Newcastle, Staffs. ARTHUR S. LANGLEY.

The Broad Church.

A PARAGRAPH in the March number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES states that *Saint Andrew* is the organ of the Broad Church party. I take the earliest opportunity of correcting that statement. From the 'Foreword' to the first number and the Explanatory Note in the second number (in which the account of the National Union Conference appeared), it can be seen that *Saint Andrew* belongs to no party. It is prepared to do for the Evangelical and High Church parties what it did for the National Union. Its object is not to reflect any sectional element, but to mirror the whole life of the Church.

EDITOR OF *Saint Andrew*.

Glasgow.

§ 70 of the Dikdûkê ha-ṭe'amîm.

THE seventieth section of the *Dikdûkê ha-ṭe'amîm*, to which I called attention in the March number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, contains a considerable number of interesting data with which I believe many readers will be glad to make acquaintance in their proper context. Hence I have the pleasure of offering here a *verbatim* translation of this section. I have taken the liberty of *numbering* all the divisions which are closed by Baer and Strack with the sign *sôph pasûq* (:) but have no number attached to them. This facilitates the citing of this long section. Further, all remarks which are not a reproduction of the text of the section are printed in *italics*. J. Dérenbourg has published the Heb. text of an essentially identical section in his *Manuel du lecteur* (1871, pp. 132–135), giving only the consonants without vowel points, and it is precisely this section to which he has devoted *no* commentary (p. 185).

1. And this is the law which Moses prescribed to the Israelites. Moses, the man of God, the father of the prophets, wrote the books of the law (תּוֹרָה, *without the article; cf., on the transition from nomen appellativum to nomen proprium, my Syntax*, § 295 *i*) and the book of Job. 2. Joshua wrote his book and also eight verses of the law, from 'and there died Moses, the servant of the LORD' (*Dt* 34[5]) to the end of the law. 3. Samuel, the prophet,—may his remembrance turn to blessing!—wrote his book and the book 'Judges' (שׁוֹפְטִים, *without the article*) and Ruth. 4. Isaiah (*instead of* יְשַׁעְיָהוּ *we find in other passages of the Massora the shorter form*, יְשַׁעְיָה, *or the abbreviation*, ישעי, *as in Okla we-okla, ed. Frensdorff*, No. 289) wrote his book and the Proverbs and the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. 5. Jeremiah wrote his book and the book 'Kings' and the roll 'Lamentations.' 6. David—may his remembrance turn to blessing!—and ten elders (variant: 'prophets') wrote the book 'Psalms' (תְּהִלּוֹת *here, instead of the usual* תְּהִלִּים *or* תִּילִים. *Also, in baba bathra* 14[b] *we have* תְּהִלִּים *or* תִּילִים, *and only these two forms are mentioned by Fürst in his work, Der Kanon des A.T. nach den Ueberlieferungen im Talmud und Midrasch*, p. 65). 7. The men of the Great Synagogue, and among them Haggia and Zechariah (*this addition is wanting in two sources*), wrote the book 'Ezekiel' and the Twelve and the book 'Daniel' and the roll 'Esther' (*on these and like data of Jewish tradition cf. the translation and discussion of baba bathra* 14 f. *in my Einleitung*, pp. 445 f.). 8. Ezra, the scribe (variant: 'Ezra and his house of judgment'), wrote his book and the genealogy of Chronicles. *These books are* established for ever and ever, made in truth and righteousness.

10. The book 'In the beginning' *is* the first book, and it is the book of the righteous ones.[1] *This covers*, from the creation of the world till the death of Joseph the righteous, a period of two thousand three hundred and nine years.

11. The second book *is called* 'and these *are* the names' (*Ex* 1[1]). This is the book of the Exodus from Egypt, and it is the book of the Covenant (*Baer compares Ex* 22[7] [*but read* 24[7]]).

[1] Baer remarks: 'Because it relates the history of the patriarchs who are called *jesharîm*, "the righteous ones," in *Aboda sara* 25[a], *Sôṭa* i. 10, *Midrash Gen.* § 6.' But it would be more accurate to state the matter thus: In '*Aboda zara* the סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר of Jos 10[13], 2 S 1[18], is defined as the book of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who are called *jesharîm*, because it is said in Nu 23 [10], 'Let my soul die the death of righteous ones (*jesharîm*).'—In Jerus. *Sôṭa* i. 10 the remark is made on 'book of the *jashar*' (2 S 1[18]) that there are two views about the latter, the one that it is the book 'In the beginning,' while תרגנ says it is the book of Numbers (חומש הפיקודים. By the way, this spelling, which we find in Jerus. Talm. [ed. Krotoschin, 1866] instead of the usual פקודים, is not mentioned by L. Blau, *Zur Einleit. in d. Heil. Schr.* 1894, p. 44). *Bereshith rabba*, Parasha 6, *ad fin.*, says, 'What is the book of the *jashar*? It is the book about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Why is it so called? See the answer in Nu 23[10].'

It runs from the death of Joseph (*literally* '*from then when died*' [משמת, *so also several times in the following text*]) to the second year of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, even to the setting up of the dwelling-place (*sc.* '*of God*'; *i.e.* '*the tent of the congregation*,' *Ex* 40^{33}): a hundred and forty years.

12. The third book *is named* 'and he called' (*Lv* 1^{1}), and this *is* the book of the law of the priests.[1] *It extends* from the setting up of the dwelling-place on the first *day* of the first month till the second month, a period of one month, as it is written, 'on the first *day* of the second month' (*Nu* 1^{1}).

13. The fourth book *is named* 'and he spake' (*Nu* 1^{1}). This *is* the book 'Fifth part (*i.e. one part of the book which consists of five parts*) of the numbered ones.'[2] *It runs* from the first *day* of the second month to the fortieth year, *and indeed* the first *day* of the eleventh month, *i.e.* thirty and eight years and nine months.

14a. The fifth book *is named* 'these *are* the words' (*Dt* 1^{1}), and this is the book of the repetition of the law (*Jerus. Megillah*, iii. 8, *and elsewhere, cf. especially L. Blau, l.c.*). *It extends* from the first *day* of the eleventh month to the tenth *day* of the first month *of the following year*: seventy days. Aaron the holy died, and Moses the meek (? העניו, *Nu* 12^{3}, *cf. my Lehrgeb.* ii. p. 76^{1}) lived yet seven months and seven days, and on a Sabbath day died the godly one—a holy and just remembrance of him turns to blessing.—14b. And this book was called the book of Moses, as it is written, 'on that day was read in the book of Moses' (*Neh* 13^{1}),—and *also* the whole law is called after the name of Moses the faithful one, as it is written, 'Remember ye the law of Moses, My servant' (*Mal* 3^{22}),—and it (*Deuteronomy*) *runs* from the first *day* of the eleventh month till the people came up from Jordan on the tenth *day* of the first month (*Jos* 4^{19}).—14c. *There are* seventy days. Deduct from these the days of mourning for Moses, *namely*, thirty days, and three days during which they prepared victuals for the march, for it is said, 'For within three days' (*Jos* 1^{11}); behold *these are* three and thirty days. *Thus* seven and thirty days are left over of the seventy days. Behold, Moses, the godly one, died on the seventh *day* in the month Adâr (*nearly* = *March*)—may the spirit of Jahveh (י *is here used*) give him rest!—and Aaron the priest died in the beginning of the month Ab (*nearly* = *August*), as it is written, 'And Aaron the priest went up into mount Hor . . . in the first *day* of the fifth month' (*Nu* 33^{38}). May the remembrance of them be for blessing and for good, O upright and godly ones,[3] and for life in the world to come (העולם הבא).

15. The book of Joshua the prophet, the first book of the *so-called* Prophets (נְבִיאִים *i.e. prophetical books*), *embraces*, from Israel's crossing of the Jordan down to the death of Joshua, seven and twenty years, and if thou wilt know this, count the number of the judges *who lived* down to *the passage* 'while Israel dwelt in Heshbon and her towns (*properly*, '*daughters*'), and in Aroer and her towns, and in all the cities that *are* along by the coasts of Arnon, three hundred years' (*Jg* 11^{26}), backwards (למפרע *is to be read lemaphrēa*', *i.e.* '*retro*'), and thou wilt recognize it. And *the Scripture* says, 'In his days did Hiel the Bethelite build Jericho, etc., according to the word of Jahveh which He spake by Joshua, the son of Nun' (*1 K* 16^{34}). This is the prophecy (*nebû'a*).

16a. The second book (*namely, of the so-called Nebi'im*), the book 'Judges,' *embraces*, from Othniel the son of Kenaz, till the death of Samson, the son of Manoah the Danite, three hundred and twenty-four years (*cf. on this number my article* '*Judges*' *in the new Dictionary of the Bible*, § 6 f.), and in the days was Eli the priest in Shiloh after Phinehas, the son of the priest Eleazar, for conformably to what is written 'and Phinehas, the son of Eleazar,' etc. (*Jg* 20^{28}), and 'Ahiah, the son of Ahitub, Ichabod's brother, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli, *was* Jahveh's priest in Shiloh' (*1 S* 14^{3}), who was priest of Jahveh in Shiloh but Eli? And on the day when Eli died was Shiloh destroyed, as it is written, 'And He forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh,' etc. (*Ps* 78^{60}).—16b. And *the Scripture* says, 'And Eli was ninety and eight years' (*1 S* 4^{15}), and *it* says, 'And there *were* the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, priests of (*or* '*to*,' *cf.*

[1] Baer says that the third book already bears this title in the Mishna, but he has not given the exact references. These are the following:—*Megillah*, iii. 5 (not 6, as in Blau, *l.c.* p. 44); *Menaḥôth*, iv. 3.

[2] The fourth constituent of the Pentateuch is called חֻמָּשׁ הַפְּקוּדִים also in the Mishna (*Joma*, vii. 1; *Sôṭa*, vii. 7 [not 9, as in Blau, *l.c.*]; *Menaḥôth*, iv. 3).

[3] In the words לברכה ולטובה הישרים וג' the *status absolutus* טובה is read also in *Manuel du lecteur*, p. 133. Hence הישרים וג' must represent the vocative, otherwise it will not construe.

my Syntax, § 286b) Jahveh' (1 *S* 1^3), and Eli was counted as a judge, and his sons were in his days in his place, and he became old and his eyes *became* heavy, *that* he could not see, and his sons died during his lifetime, and he was priest forty years, and was judge forty years, and died—may his remembrance be for blessing!—and from Othniel till the accession of the judge Eli were three hundred and twenty-four years.

17. The book Samuel *includes*, from the time when Eli was counted as judge in Shiloh down to the death of David, king of Israel, ninety-three years, *namely*, forty of Eli, and eleven years of Samuel and two years of Saul and forty years of king David.

18. The book of the Kings *includes*, from the accession of Solomon, the son of David, down to the destruction of the first temple, four hundred and eleven years and six months and ten days.—19a. Truth and a thing to be trusted, clear and right *is it*: Joshua ministered (שימש even and twenty years; the ark and the altar made (*were, or dwelt*) in Gilgal fourteen years, *namely*, seven during which they subdued (*the Canaanites*), and seven during which they divided (*the land*); in Shiloh *was the ark* three hundred and sixty-nine years, in Kiriath-jearim dwelt the ark twenty years, namely, eleven years of the prophet Samuel and two years of Saul and seven years of king David, and in the eighth year David brought up the ark from Kiriath-jearim to Jerusalem, as it is written, 'But the ark of God had David brought up from Kiriath-jearim, etc., for he had pitched a tent for it at Jerusalem' (2 *Ch* 1^4).—19b. The altar *was* in Gibeon forty-four years, the ark in Zion seven and thirty years, till Solomon brought it up into a house of perpetuity (עולמים), as it is written, 'And the king Solomon, and all the congregation of Israel that were assembled unto him, etc., and the priests brought the ark of the covenant of Jahveh into its (>his) place,' etc. (2 *Ch* $5^{6f.}$), and he brought thither the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar, as it is written, 'And they brought up,' etc. (2 *Ch* 5^5).

20a. The book of the prophet Isaiah *embraces*, from Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, down to the first year of Manasseh, a hundred and fourteen years.—20b. No persons have prophesied many years besides of (*i.e. more years than*) Isaiah, the son of Amoz, the prophet, and Hosea, the son of Beeri, and Micah (*cf. Is* 1^1, *Hos* 1^1, *Mic* 1^1).

21a. The book of Jeremiah *embraces*, from the thirteenth year of Josiah, the son of Amon, king of Judah, down to the destruction of the first temple, one and forty years and six months and ten days, and *the Scripture* saith, after the destruction of the first temple, in the three and twentieth year of Nebuchadrezzar (*Jer* 52^{30}): 'In the eighteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar (*Jer* 52^{29}) the temple was destroyed, and he carried away captive Zedekiah to Babylon,' and so (*cf.* וכן *in Manuel du lecteur*, p. 135) it says, 'And it came to pass, in the seven and thirtieth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin, king of Judah' (52^{31}).—21b. That is the year in which Nebuchadnezzar the wicked one died, and from the thirteenth year of Josiah till the time when the laughter (?; *instead of* שחיק of *Baer-Strack's text*, *we find* שחוק *in Manuel du lecteur*, p. 135) of the bones (עצמות) of Nebuchadnezzar died, *are* sixty-seven years.

22. The book of Ezekiel *runs* from the fifth *day* of the (*fourth* [*Ezk* 1^{1a}] *is wanting*) month, this (= *namely*) is the fifth year of deportation of king Jehoiachin, until *the passage*, 'in the five and twentieth year of our captivity' (40^1).

23. The book of Hosea, the son of Beeri, this is the book of the twelve prophets, *embraces* three hundred and twenty-seven years, *i.e.* from king Uzziah to the year in which Alexander came. Until this time the prophets prophesied, during the existence of the second temple, in the days of Darius and Artachshasta (*Artaxerxes*), and prophecy ceased.

24. The book of Chronicles *embraces*, from the creation of the world down to the advent of Cyrus, king of Persia, three thousand three hundred and ninety-one years.

25. The book of Ezra, the priest, *embraces*, from the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, down to the thirty-second year of king Artaxerxes, one and fifty years, as it is written, 'And after certain days (*Baer-Strack wrongly give* הימים, *instead of* ימים, *the reading in Manuel du lecteur*) obtained I leave of the king' (*Neh* 13^6).

Ed. König.

Rostock.

On Job v. 5 and other Passages.

Job 5^5. — Sympathizing strongly with Professor Hommel's anxiety to make criticism more archæological, I am nevertheless opposed to forcing the lock of this hard passage. That צַמִּים is wrong, both here and in 18^9, is certain. That וְאֶל־מְצִנִּים is impossible, is even more obvious. But surely we ought to correct the text in accordance with the truly poetic style of such descriptions elsewhere; we ought also to produce symmetrical groups of lines. The ethnic names (unless it were ערבי) are therefore plainly inappropriate, and v.^{5b} is superfluous. In v.^{5c}, to correspond to יאכל, we require, not שְׁאָף, but שְׁתָה. צמים חיכם should

probably be צְמָא חֲמֹרִם. V.^{2b} is a corruption of יאכל צמא חמרם; the scribe wrote יאכל by mistake, (dittography), instead of שחה, and (as usual) when he corrected his error, left the faulty words uncancelled. I believe this to be a certain correction. I wish it had ancient authority. Aq., Symm., Pesh. do, however, sanction the reading 'the thirsty' in v.^{5c}. Ⓖ's ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτῶν may have enticed Mr. Herz into a wrong path. Cf. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1897, p. 576.

Ps 45^{11}.—For the suspicious בת וראי read בת מצרים, O Egyptian maiden!

Ps 45^{11}.—For the incomplete ובת־צר' (note the warning Pasek) read וישתחוו־לך בת־מצר (צור). צר (מצור) is mutilated from מצר, as in 83^{8} 87^{4}, where, however, it is the N. Arabian land of Musur which is meant. Here it is an Egyptian maiden who is referred to. The Psalm describes the Messianic king as if a second (idealized) Solomon. Cf. *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, pp. 106 f.

Ps 81^{4}.—בְּחֹדֶשׁ, improbable. בכסה, is this = לום ח', is this really '*for* our feast-day'? בכסא? For בחדש שופר read שׁוֹפָר בְּקָדְשׁוֹ. For בכסה read בקדש; it is a dittogram, and to be cancelled. In v.^{4b} read הללו יהוה מלכנו. The verse is—

> Blow the horn in his sanctuary,
> Sing to Yahwè our king.

Am 8^{9}.—For ביום אור read בעוד יום, 'while it is yet day'; cf. Jer 15^{9}. The phrase 'in a day of light' is impossible (Gn 1^{5}). T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

On Mark xii. 42.

THE opinion stated by Professor Blass, and criticised by me, was to the effect that (at the time of the Gospels) 'the *quadrans* was familiar to the Greeks': his main ground for this statement was that 'the Roman coins, like the *quadrans*, were in circulation throughout the whole Roman empire.' Naturally, I objected to this statement, as any person who has studied the elements of numismatic facts as ordinarily accepted would. The learned professor now admits that his expression 'was inexact'; and I accept the recantation. But he still maintains his opinion, though he no longer upholds the main ground on which his opinion rested. He is quite as confident as ever that his opinion is correct; only the reason to which he trusted was wrong. He now makes a still more extraordinary defence: it is so carefully vague, that it is not easy to grasp: 'The provincial cities . . . struck their bronze coins partly, or mostly, if not according to the Roman system, at least with the Roman designations.' For this statement he gives no reason. There is none to give. He gives a vague reference to Mommsen, *Röm. Münzw.* (p. 708, and especially p. 718), who mentions bronze coins with the letters S.C., *i.e. Senatus Consulto*. He adds, 'Of course these coins had their Latin names.' Why 'of course'? If I say, 'Of course the Greeks called these coins by their own Greek names,' what will Professor Blass say? It is a matter of evidence. I have quoted the negative evidence that, whereas Roman silver coins on the Roman standard were common,—and the Rome name grecized occurs with immense frequency in Greek inscriptions of Asia,—names of Roman bronze coins rarely occur, and the *quadrans* never; because the cities used chiefly their own bronze. Professor Blass replies that 'this does not affect the case,' because there was 'rarely occasion for using the name of so small a coin.' Why was there so rarely such occasion? The people were not rich in coin. We frequently speak of pennies and halfpennies. Why should not the ancients speak of a *quadrans*, which had much greater purchasing power than a halfpenny? But, in fact, though the Latin names for bronze coins do not occur, the Greek names do.

I have not time or space to go into this subject; I will merely point out one or two facts. Bronze coins of Chios often bear their names and value in the legend stamped on them; during the first century the names are Greek: ὄβολος, τετράχαλκον, τρίχαλκον, δίχαλκον.

After the Antonine period began, Latin names were introduced: ἀσσάρια τρία, δύο, ἀσσάριον ἥμυσυ (*sic*!). See Head, *Catalogue of Brit. Mus. Coins of Ionia*.

The legend OBOλος occurs on coins of the Syrian city, Selencia Pieria, as late as the third century. The evidence, then, of actual fact is that the Roman names of bronze coins penetrated so far east as Chios, in the Ægean Sea, only during the second century. Greek names of bronze coins are found in use in a Syrian city as late as the third century. What fact has Professor Blass to quote in proof of his assumption that the name of the *quadrans* was familiar in Syria during the first half of the first century? I ask for facts, not for opinions. When I desire opinions I go to the professional numismatists; and so far as I know they are all dead against Professor Blass, whose brilliant scholarship has never been directed to numismatic studies, and who is not doing himself justice when he tries to settle such questions by an *obiter dictum*. W. M. RAMSAY.

Aberdeen.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The second volume of the new Dictionary of the Bible is now ready. It contains 870 pages, and runs from Feign to Kinsman. Within that space fall some of the most important subjects that a Dictionary of the Bible has to deal with.

The letters F and G are mainly English. They therefore contain an unusual proportion of the Editor's own articles. These are not old English words alone. The old English words are explained, and illustrated from contemporary writers. And that not only when they are obsolete, but also when they have partly shifted their meaning. For there the danger of misunderstanding is much greater. It is easy to be arrested by the verb to *fray*, and it is easy to explain its meaning. But when we read in Ps 59^{15}: 'Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied,' it is possible that we may not understand that 'grudge' in this sense has now given place to 'grumble.'

But there are words and phrases that demand attention, not because they are obsolete and not because they have shifted their meaning, but because they are not English at all, and never were. They contradict the genius of the English language, and all the popularity of the Authorized Version has failed to introduce them into the literary or current speech. They are to a large extent bold metaphors, like 'go a whoring after.' The unwary reader either misses their force or mistakes their poetry for Western prose. How much of our popular theology has gone astray through their misapprehension. In his valuable companion to the Psalter of the Prayer Book, Dr. Driver has always kept a watchful eye for such expressions, and even added an exhaustive list of them at the end. What wealth of unseen instruction there lies in this field will be seen by any reader of the new volume of the *Dictionary* who turns to the elaborate article on the verb to *go*.

The great letter in this volume is the letter J. The letter J may be said to give character to the volume. For the second volume covers an unusual number of great subjects, and these belong mostly to J. We have only to recall the books James, Jeremiah, Job, Joel, John, Jonah, Joshua, and Judges; the men Jacob, John, Joseph, Judas Iscariot; the places Jerusalem, Jordan, Judæa; and the doctrines of Jealousy, Joy, Judgment, and Justification. But the other letters are rich in this respect also. And it is into this volume that there fall the three great articles on God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

These subjects have never before been handled in a Dictionary of the Bible with the same fulness. There is also a special character that ought to belong to a Dictionary article, and they seem

to us to approach it very nearly. They not only present the available information in an easily ascertainable form, they not only lead forward to further study, but they gather the data into results, and they suggest principles which are instinct with spirit and with life. The article God is written by Professor A. B. Davidson and Professor Sanday. It runs from page 196 to page 215. The article Holy Spirit is written by Professor Swete. It is found between pages 402 and 411. The article Jesus Christ is written by Dr. Sanday, and covers 51 pages, from 603 to 653.

The time spent upon this volume is, of course, much more than the year that has elapsed since the issue of Volume I. And it is possible that the rate of issue may seem to some too slow. But they would not think so if they knew what a volume demands. Though there are many large articles, there are many more that are small, and they are usually very successful in hiding the labour which they cost. It is with thankfulness we see the work fully half accomplished, for the third volume is already well advanced. And if the second volume receives as hearty an appreciation as the first, we shall not grudge the time or the toil that have been given to it.

Now that Professor Ramsay has shown us how to understand the Enrolment under Quirinius, the greatest historical difficulty, we suppose, in the New Testament is the reconciliation of the Book of Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians about the early movements of St. Paul. In the Acts St. Luke says (9^{19-22}): 'And he was certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus. And straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus, that He is the Son of God. And all that heard him were amazed, and said, Is not this he that in Jerusalem made havock of them which called on this Name? and he had come hither for this intent, that he might bring them bound before the chief priests. But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ.' In Galatians (1^{15-17}) St. Paul himself says: 'But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me: but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned unto Damascus.'

The Rev. P. M. Barnard, M.A., in a short paper in the *Expositor* for April, seeks to reconcile that seeming contradiction. His method is very simple. He believes that St. Luke has told us in the shortest space of two distinct visits to Damascus. The first visit he describes as being over within 'certain days' (ἡμέρας τινάς), the second as lasting 'many days' (9^{23}, ἡμέραι ἱκαναί). In the first visit St. Paul knew only that Jesus was the Son of God (observe that the correct reading is not as A.V., 'he preached Christ,' but as R.V., 'he proclaimed *Jesus*'). At the second visit he knows that Jesus is the Messiah,—'proving that this is the Christ.' How do we account for this development in the apostle's preaching? He tells us himself in Galatians. He had spent some time in Arabia, and learned it there in intercourse with God. St. Luke's words, Mr. Barnard thinks, when closely studied, reveal two distinct visits to Damascus, a shorter and a longer. And St. Paul's words in Galatians 'clearly imply that his sojourn in Arabia fell between a short and a long stay at Damascus.'

Canon Winterbotham, whose book on *The Kingdom of Heaven* was noticed last month, is much perplexed with our Lord's saying, 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.' He rejects the explanation that the needle's eye is the little gate at the side of the great one, through which a camel may just pass if it is first unloaded. 'That gate is a product (and a monument) of Western stupidity in

dealing with our Lord's words.' It is simply a very ordinary proverb to express what we should call 'perfectly impossible.' And as such, he is greatly perplexed by it.

For he finds it universally taught that a rich man may be a good Christian and die in the Lord, without devoting more than a small percentage of his wealth to good works. And not only is this taught, but experience shows that rich men do actually enter the kingdom. That is to say, they are indistinguishable to our eye from others whom we believe to enter the kingdom, unless it be by their superior sanctity and self-denial. And so Canon Winterbotham is led to conclude that our Lord did not mean the saying to express a permanent feature of His kingdom. It may have been impossible for a rich man to die a Christian then; it is not impossible now.

But there is one thing that it is impossible for a rich man to do still. It is impossible for him to preach the gospel. To the poor the gospel is still preached, and only by the poor. That is to say, it is to the mass that the gospel comes, to that enormous majority of mankind which is poor, and the poor will listen only to those who share the narrowness and sadness of their lot. Our Lord Himself had to become poor that He might preach to the people. And it is here that Canon Winterbotham finds light on the text that perplexes him. When our Lord said, 'Enter the kingdom of heaven,' He meant more than we vulgarly mean by salvation. He included service. A rich man may be saved in our modern sense, but he cannot turn his gifts and capacities to use in the Master's service, he cannot enter fully into the kingdom of heaven.

Professor Jannaris of St. Andrews is a stimulating writer, and the author of the most authoritative Grammar of Historical Greek in the English language. He has contributed an article to the *Expositor* for April, in which he argues that a long passage in our Lord's intercessory prayer has been hitherto wholly misunderstood.

It is the passage beginning Jn 17^{18} and continuing to the end of the chapter. In these nine verses the particle ἵνα occurs ten times, and each time it is mistranslated in the English versions. Take the first occurrence, 'And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, *that* they themselves also *may* be sanctified in truth.' Such is the rendering of the Revised Version. And expositors have given themselves to the effort of explaining how our Lord's sanctification of Himself could be the means of our sanctification. Professor Jannaris says it is a misinterpretation of the passage. The particle ἵνα with its subjunctive, rendered here 'that . . . may,' is really an imperative. What our Lord spoke was therefore: 'In their behalf I am sanctifying Myself. May they also be sanctified in truth!'

For this particle ἵνα has a history. Originally it was a weak synonym for ὅπως, 'in order that.' Then it took the place of that conjunction in ordinary speech (perhaps, suggests Professor Jannaris, under the influence of the Roman *utinam*, as if *ut-ina-m*), sending ὅπως into mere literary or artificial language. Next it began to elbow the infinitive. For a time the infinitive, pressed on this side, stretched away on another, and took up the ground of the participle, ἐν τῷ λέγειν being largely used in biblical Greek for the classical λέγων, 'while speaking.' But ἵνα still pressed on. In the Greek of the Middle Ages it has dislodged the infinitive entirely.

Now one of the functions of the infinitive in classical Greek was to express a demand or a wish—to do duty, in short, for the imperative. And this usage survived into New Testament times. Thus in Ro 12^{15} we translate, 'Rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with them that weep,' where the Greek is χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. Again, in Lk 9^{3}, the R.V. gives, 'Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor wallet,

nor bread, nor money; neither have two coats,' and the Greek is first an imperative and then an infinitive (*μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν, μήτε ῥάβδον, μήτε πήραν, μήτε ἄρτον, μήτε ἀργύριον· μήτε δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν*).

But, even in classical Greek, *ἵνα* sometimes takes the place of this infinitive. And in the New Testament that is common. In Col 4^{16} St. Paul is made to say, 'And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.' But Professor Jannaris believes that the apostle wrote better grammar than that. The usual infinitive expressive of a wish has been displaced by *ἵνα* with the subjunctive. Then the translation is, 'And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause it to be read also in the church of the Laodiceans. Moreover, do ye also read the epistle from Laodicea.'

Again, in Mk 5^{23} the English translators have had recourse to an insertion in order to express the grammar accurately. All that the Greek gives is, 'My little daughter is at the point of death, that Thou come and lay Thy hands on her, that she may be made whole, and live.' The English versions insert 'I pray thee' before 'that Thou come.' But Professor Jannaris translates, '*do come* and lay Thy hands on her, so that she may be saved, and live.' This, then, is the way he would render the ten instances of *ἵνα* with the subjunctive in Jn $17^{18\text{-}26}$. To take the last verse as example: 'I have both declared unto them Thy name, and will be declaring it. May the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me be among them! I also among them!'

Under the heading of 'Episcopacy and Sacerdotalism,' Professor Sanday has contributed an article to the *Guardian* of 29th March. It is in the form of a reply to the review of his recent book by Dr. Moberly. Not that Dr. Sanday takes exception to that review. That was scarcely possible, notwithstanding that we believe the author of the book and his reviewer are fundamentally at variance. For Dr. Moberly recognized that the purpose of the book was to bring together the two sides in the controversy that is at present rending the Church of England, and he passed over the fundamental differences in acknowledging the Christian spirit of the effort at reconciliation. Dr. Sanday's reply is therefore an acknowledgment of the courtesy of the reviewer, and a disclosure of his own spiritual atmosphere of the most candid and impressive kind.

Professor Sanday fears that his position may be misunderstood. He has not received any 'redding stroke.' And on that account he thinks it possible that he may be considered the advocate of compromises. He does not in the least believe that truth lies in compromises, or that real differences can be glossed over by ambiguities of language. But, for all that, he admits the existence in his mind of things that are opposite, and even of some—perhaps not a few—that are incompatible. For the seeker after truth is constantly discovering that his denials have been too sweeping, and that the adversary has positions and arguments as good as his own. His very purpose therefore was to prevent principles that seem different from being recognized as incompatible before they have been fully tested. He does not think that the wolf and the lamb are ready to lie down together, but he would remind us that all the occupants of our fields are not either wolves or lambs.

Then Dr. Sanday seems ready to make concessions. He goes as far as it is safe to go. We must not allow him to go too far. Of the two methods of reaching truth, the inductive and the deductive, Dr. Moberly had complained that he made too little of the second. Dr. Sanday admits that he has had a prejudice against the deductive method, or, perhaps, rather a prejudice in favour of the inductive; and he says, 'This is just one of the instances in which I have dis-

covered, late in the day, that an old prejudice was not as well founded as I thought. As far back as I can remember, even before I came up to Oxford, a deep impression was made upon me by Butler's *Analogy*. One fixed conclusion that I carried away with me from that work was that deductive arguments in the sphere of theology were highly precarious; that our real concern was not with what *ought* to be, or what *must* be in the Divine economy, but rather with what *is*, or in the historical sense, what *has been*. This naturally led up to the use of the so-called historical method, which in these days enjoys much favour; and, to the extent of my ability, I have spent most of my life in trying to apply it.'

But in the last year or two, 'since I came to know Dr. Moberly,' Dr. Sanday confesses that he has become aware that the deductive method has a larger and more legitimate function than he had supposed. As wielded by Dr. Moberly, he sees that it is an engine of great power, and he has no wish to question it. He still thinks that it is like the bow of Ulysses. Ulysses himself can bend and use it. He is not so sure of the other inhabitants of Ithaca. He will not prejudge them, but he would like to see them trying their skill before he expresses an opinion.

Now it has seemed to some of us that it is just here that the essential weakness and vice (we use the word in its technical sense) of Dr. Moberly's position comes in. And it is the boldness with which he takes up the bow of Ulysses that makes him dangerous. Dr. Moberly writes a large book on the meaning of Christian Priesthood. He disclaims special knowledge of the subject. He does not think that special knowledge is necessary in order to the writing of the best, that is, the most scientific, book. What he lacks in knowledge he supplies in reasoning. In other words, Dr. Moberly displaces the inductive gathering and interpretation of facts for the deductions of an acute ecclesiastical mind. He does not count it necessary to discover all that *has been*; to supplement the deficiency, he calls in the aid of what *must* or *ought* to be.

All this is boldly stated in Dr. Moberly's preface. And it is there we find the following illustration of his method. 'It would be hard,' says Dr. Moberly, 'to find a scholar of graver or more solid judgment than Dr. Hort.' But Dr. Hort was an inductive scholar. He gathered facts, and when he had gathered all that he could find, he drew conclusions from them. Sometimes these conclusions were negative. Thus he concluded that the apostles received from our Lord no authority to govern in the Church; he concluded that there were no *ecclesiae* as a result of St. Paul's first missionary journey in Europe; he concluded that the *deacon* had nothing to do with teaching; and that the connexion between laying on of hands and ordination to ministry was rather accidental than important.

Now it is possible that Dr. Hort had not sufficient data to draw these negative conclusions from. When Mr. Cooke wrote his appreciation of Professor Driver in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of last September, one was struck with his picture of the lectures that were 'an education in scientific method. There is the searching examination of the grammar of the text, the masterly grouping of illustrative material, and then the carefully worded, exact induction.' But especially was one struck with this: 'When his result is reached, it is stated with clear and resolute precision; when it is impossible to be certain, he says so frankly. How familiar to his pupils is such a remark as "The data are not sufficient to warrant us in forming any certain conclusion."'

It is possible, we say, that sometimes Dr. Hort drew negative conclusions when the data were not sufficient to warrant him in forming any certain conclusion. But that is not the ground on which Dr. Moberly condemns him. He condemns him for not adding to his data such theological prepossessions as would have made a negative con-

clusion on these subjects impossible. Dr. Sanday has done more than any living man to teach us the value and use of the inductive method of historical investigation. It is by the use of that method that the great advances have been made in New Testament study within the last quarter of a century. Surely he is not going to destroy or dilute its force by the introduction now of every man's theological presuppositions. Certainly there is a function for deduction in New Testament investigation, as in every other branch of inquiry, but that function is not to fill up the gaps that are left by the available historical data.

Dr. Moberly, we are aware, says that men have their presuppositions in any case, and all that he argues for is that, instead of being covered up and ignored, these should be carefully taken account of. And certainly we agree with him in thinking that a man who swept the heavens with his telescope and said he had not found God, is not to be accepted as an infallible guide in theology. But we say to such a man, Make your induction larger. We do not say to him, First believe in a God and then add Him to the discoveries of your telescope.

There is an excellent example of Dr. Moberly's method in the very next subject which Dr. Sanday deals with. And it is a relief to find that, though Dr. Sanday gives in on the general principle, he differs on its application. The subject is Schism. Dr. Moberly holds 'that wilful breach of organized unity is to the conscience of an instructed Christian "schism," and that "schism" is not only a mistake but a sin.' Well, the Reformers were guilty of 'breach of organised unity.' The only point where induction comes into play is in determining whether it was wilful. Dr. Sanday shows that it was not. Dr. Moberly holds that it was. His theological presupposition is a trained disbelief in the wisdom of the Reformation. It is enough in this instance to turn the scale. The consequence, for the Church of Scotland, for example, is somewhat serious.

But, after all, we do Professor Sanday injustice. It is not possible for him to fall back upon *à priori* methods and accept Dr. Moberly's conclusions. He sees with innate clearness that the time for that is past. In the matter of 'apostolic succession' it is the evidence that he relies upon. He is not concerned to deny that from the end of the second century a certain mode of conveyance—conveyance of authorization for ministry—has been practised. He does not doubt that even before that date a similar mode had been practised—'but with what degree of regularity and how far back that regularity extended, the evidence does not permit us to determine.' Wherefore he is not prepared so to erect it into a law of the Divine action as to say that there is no blessing conveyed by any other.

But if he does not do that, then, on Dr. Moberly's principles and practices, he might as well, theologically speaking, never have been born. And there are deeper things than that. Dr. Sanday is unable to accept a mechanical theory of the laying on of hands. It is no doubt, he says, a widespread idea that the laying on of hands denotes *transmission*—the transmission of a property possessed by one person to another. But it cannot mean that. It is a common accompaniment of 'blessing'; but 'blessing' means the invoking of blessing. For it is God who blesses or bestows the gift. It is not implied that the gift should be even previously possessed by him who invokes it.

The passage that has touched us most, however, is one of such intimate autobiography as only the strong can use. In his book Dr. Sanday had said that the Christian dies to sin in the strength of Christ, 'on whom his affections are so concentrated that it is as if Christ and he were actually one.' Dr. Moberly took exception to the words 'as if.' He called it an unscriptural touch. He said that no 'as if' in such a context was needed to make Scripture language intelligible or real. And he added that when the 'as if' was taken away, the difference was removed between sacrificing and pleading or presenting a sacrifice.

By that we suppose Dr. Moberly means that if Christ and we are actually one, then when we present our bodies a living sacrifice to God we present Christ, and so become sacrificing priests. But it is Dr. Sanday we are following at present. 'To me,' says Dr. Sanday, 'this paragraph is deeply interesting, and I suspect that it will be to not a few besides. I greatly hope that it may not be long before Dr. Moberly finds an opportunity to explain his meaning more fully.' We greatly hope so also. But we are following Dr. Sanday, and now must quote him word for word.

'I look back upon a time when the words "as if" came to me as the solution of a problem by which I had been much perplexed. I had asked myself, What is the meaning of the strong language about union with Christ which we find in St. Paul's Epistles, and notably in Romans vi.? How are we to translate it into terms of our own experience? I argued thus: Actual union it cannot mean, because that would imply a fusion of personalities, and fusion of personalities is impossible. If there is one thing that personality means, it is distinctness. I am myself and no one else. But what is the nearest thing in human experience to the fusion of personalities? I answered—and here I thought that I had found the key to St. Paul's language—Surely it must be in the line of affection, when—

> Heart with heart in concord beat,
> And the lover is beloved.

The most effective way of getting rid of selfishness and self-will is through some overpowering attachment. There, at last, you may have two wills really acting as one. On that analogy I could explain and make real to myself the seemingly mystical language of St. Paul. His great moral leverage is the attachment of the Christian to Christ. That is at bottom what he means by *faith*.'

There is a frankness about such a statement that is both refreshing and encouraging. And surely it is right. No doubt Dr. Sanday could have brought the Holy Spirit in. But it is not the operation he is seeking to describe, it is the experience. And as an experience, he is certainly right when he says that his view is at least real so far as it goes. He thinks it may be possible to go farther. He thinks the thought of our time is preparing itself for a farther advance on this subject. It may be so. But we doubt very much if it is on Dr. Moberly's lines that the advance is likely to be made.

The foregoing Notes had just been written when Harnack's new book arrived fresh from the publishers. It is described as *Thoughts on Protestantism* (A. & C. Black, 1s. 6d. net). It is from first to last a protest against the introduction of theological prepossession into our study of the Old and New Testaments or of Christianity. Once, says Harnack, there was no such study; *all* was theological prepossession. Then there arose the historical sense. A revolution followed in the history of mankind no less great than has been produced by the discoveries of natural science. 'We are all aware now that to dictate to knowledge the result at which it is to arrive is to make knowledge impossible.'

That the return to mediævalism—by which is conveniently designated the principles and practices of Christianity in the Roman Church before the Reformation—that the return to mediævalism is impossible on the lines of pure historical scholarship Harnack makes very plain. We should first have to return to the method of research that made mediævalism. And although Harnack's interference will not stay the movement in that direction, for there is no man living whom the advocate of theological prepossession more heartily distrusts, yet his little book is timely enough. For to all others it makes it clear that to follow Dr. Moberly in this is to separate oneself both from all our recent gains in knowledge and from all our present historical and scientific methods.

The 'Speaking with Tongues' of the Early Christians.

By Carl Clemen, Ph.D., Halle, Germany.

In the year 1833 there appeared in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* a plea for a new arrangement of the sermon with reference to its form and content. The author, Klaus Harms, was generally known through his ninety-five theses against Rationalism, which were issued on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the Reformation. As a title to his article on the sermon, he used the words: 'With tongues! Dear brethren, speak with tongues!' He knew very well that a correct interpretation of the biblical expression would not permit of this application, but he evidently did not comprehend the full meaning of the words, or he would scarcely have thus used them. What, then, does the formula, 'to speak with tongues,' really mean according to its original interpretation?

From the second and third centuries on, the customary interpretation has been: *to speak in foreign languages*. Origen, and probably Irenæus, thus explained the expression, and at the present time it is so understood by many theologians and the majority of the laity.

In fact, the speaking 'with other tongues' in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. 2) is undoubtedly intended to mean speaking in foreign languages. It is there said of the disciples that on the first Pentecost after the Lord's death, 'they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance' (v.[4]). Since the same expression is used farther on (v.[11]) to mean speaking in foreign languages, it would naturally bear the same meaning in the above verse.

There has been a desire, it is true, to draw from v.[11] such an explanation of the miracle of speaking as to make it one of hearing, but v.[4] is decisive against this idea. For, in harmony with that verse, the subsequent statements are to be understood: 'Every man heard them speaking in his own language' (v.[6]); 'and how hear we every man in our own language, wherein we were born' (v.[8]); 'we hear them speaking in our tongues of the mighty works of God' (v.[11]).

These same verses render it still less possible to conceive, as among others Goethe attempted, of this speaking with other tongues as speaking in an absolutely new language, which was at once intelligible to all, and even appeared as their mother tongue. For, in that case, we should not have the simple statement, 'Every man heard them speaking in his own language,' but rather something like this: 'Every man heard them *as though* they were speaking in his own language.'

But on other grounds, it is possible to doubt the correctness of the usual interpretation of the miracle, as one of speaking in foreign languages. The Acts of the Apostles mention in two other passages (10^{46} 19^{6}) the circumstance of speech with tongues without any reference whatever to foreign languages. What good purpose, moreover, would have been served, if Cornelius and his household, or the disciples of John whom Paul baptized, had spoken in foreign languages? But now in the first passage (10^{47} 11^{15}) the phenomenon in question is compared with the Pentecost miracle, although it is described by another phrase, not as speaking 'with *other* tongues,' but only as speaking 'with tongues.' Does it therefore follow that the phenomenon of Pentecost was not originally considered a miracle of speaking in other tongues?

The following considerations, however, are the only really decisive ones. First, according to Ac 2^{13}, some of those present at the festival at Pentecost explained the apostles' speech with tongues, as due to drunkenness. On this point Herder remarked, when over a hundred years ago he discussed the gift of speech at the first Christian Pentecost Festival, 'Where is the vineyard full of sweet wine, in which foreign, unknown languages can be suddenly learned?' This criticism of the audience really does not at all suit the phenomenon just described. For even if one would like to explain this criticism as malicious perversion, such a possibility would be excluded by Herder's further statement: 'Not only does the author relate this derisive explanation of the Pentecost miracle, as seriously as he has told of the miracle itself, and of the astonishment of the others at it; but even Peter, in explaining the inspiration with speech, takes it into serious consideration. He defends his com-

panions by saying that they are not drunken, since it is but the third hour of the day, etc. But what would he have said if it had been later in the day? Could anyone, by filling himself with sweet wine, speak languages he had never learned? Peter no more than Luke would have wished to say that; for he plainly speaks to the mockers just as he would to reasonable men, who are capable of being persuaded: "Ye men of Judea, be this known unto you, and give ear unto my words. These are not drunken, as ye suppose,"' etc.

To this consideration yet another is to be added. We have just seen that Peter directed his address to Jews and dwellers in Jerusalem, that is, Israelites, his brethren (vv.[14. 22. 29]). On the other hand the author designates (v.[5]) those who were present, in the first place it is true, as Jews dwelling at Jerusalem, but then as 'devout men from every nation under heaven'; whereby apparently real representatives of the different nations of the earth are meant. But even if the phrase, 'Jews dwelling at Jerusalem,' might lead one to reject this explanation, that which follows must dispel that doubt. In the list of names (vv.[9-11]), which not accidentally is customarily designated as the catalogue of nations, these people describe themselves simply Parthians, Medes, Elamites, etc. The Jews of the Diaspora, however, were not accustomed thus to designate themselves, especially when they were in the Holy City among their brethren. Besides, in addition to the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, etc., there are also Jews or proselytes mentioned, so that the former could not themselves have been either Jews or proselytes. It is true that many attempts have been made to regard this clause, 'Jews and proselytes,' as explanatory apposition to the remainder; but in that case it ought to stand at the end of the whole list and be marked in some manner or other *as* appository. Finally, we may still less apply these words to the clause which immediately precedes them, 'Roman citizens temporarily stationed in Jerusalem' (R.V.: 'sojourners from Rome'), for under this expression real heathens and not Jews are to be understood. The contradiction between vv.[5-11] and the ones that follow, is therefore undeniable. In the former, heathens and Jews, in the latter, only Jews, are represented as being present at the miracle at Pentecost.

Plainly this discord in our account is indissolubly connected with the one we have first considered. Where a speaking in foreign languages is assumed, there must too be postulated representatives of these foreign nations. Moreover, it has already been shown that the narrative in its further course knows nothing of either the one or the other. Not only, then, must the idea of speaking in foreign languages, but also the notion of the presence of the representatives themselves, have been added later.

Whether these additions can be separated from our present text so that the original account will be recognizable, it is not necessary here to consider. I believe that it is possible, yet it is not of great importance in the present connexion. Only, we must settle with all possible brevity the question how our current idea of the miracle has arisen.

We can scarcely hold that at a later time the speaking in tongues came generally, and without further explanation, to be looked upon as speaking in *foreign* languages, for in that case this essential element would have been arbitrarily added in thought. Rather is it the case, as Herder, again, has seen, and the most divergent theologians since his time have recognized, that we have here an imitation of the Jewish tradition of the promulgation of the law on Sinai. 'Although the ten commandments,' says a Midrash of the ninth century, which, however, gives on this point only the old tradition, 'were announced with a single sound, yet all the people heard the voice.' That was possible thus: when the voice was uttered, it was divided into seven voices and then changed into seventy tongues, and every nation heard the law in its mother tongue. After this fashion, then, it came to be believed that the first Christian sermon was heard by each man in his native language.

But original tradition was only of such an inspired announcement of the mighty works of God, that it filled one with astonishment, provoked another to mockery, and was designated moreover as a speaking with tongues (not with other tongues). Of what nature this speaking was, we gather as little here as in the two other references in the Book of Acts. For in 10^{46} it is described only as a praising of God, and in 19^{6} it is connected with prophecy. What it really was, is not explained by such expressions.

The mention of the subject in the (not genuine) conclusion to the Gospel by Mark is still less clear. This account, written perhaps by the Pres-

byter Aristion, in the beginning of the second century, gives the Lord's announcement to his disciples that they would speak with new tongues (v.[17]). This expression can scarcely mean languages, which up to that time were unknown to them; but what then does it mean? The reference itself gives no further information than that this speaking with tongues (for perhaps the promise was only concerning tongues, not *new* tongues) was a wonderful phenomenon of the same order as the casting out of demons.

Finally, when we consider for a moment the later references to the matter in the Catholic Fathers, we find that Irenæus says that many brethren could be heard in the Church at his time who had prophetic gifts, who spoke through the Spirit in different tongues, and who, with the aim of being useful, brought to light the hidden things of men and explained the secrets of God (*Adv. Haer.* 5. 6, 1). But previously he had pictured the speaking with tongues (at least according to the old Latin translation of his work) as speaking in all languages, just as the miracle at Pentecost, which, indeed, from the Acts could not be otherwise understood (3. 17, 2). Such a speaking in foreign languages, however, by means of which the hidden things of men were brought to light and the secrets of God explained, Irenæus himself had certainly not heard. He must, therefore, have had absolutely no personal observation of the phenomenon, but described it only on the evidence of the Acts of the Apostles and the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the statements of which, in his opinion, were not mutually inconsistent.

It is different with Tertullian. In his polemic against Marcion, he challenges him to produce a psalm, a vision, a prayer, that is to say, a spiritual one, spoken in ecstasy, that is, in unconsciousness, if only an interpretation of the tongue was added (5. 8). Thus 'tongue' is understood to mean a prayer spoken in ecstasy, and we find here an element that has nowhere appeared in the previously mentioned descriptions of the phenomena, and yet is of the greatest importance for a better understanding of the subject. One might say truly that it is only a later montanistic idea of speaking in tongues which Tertullian here portrays, from which inferences as to the first Christian form of the phenomenon ought not to be drawn. We must therefore leave this description of Tertullian's for the present, and first examine the speaking with tongues of the early Christians, after which we shall return to the consideration of the montanistic prophecy.

The only remaining sources for the investigation of the matter, namely, the writings of Paul and particularly the First Epistle to the Corinthians, are, however, sources of the highest value, for the apostle says of himself (1 Co 14[18]): 'I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all.' His testimony, therefore, will be reliable throughout.

In this investigation the genuineness of the Epistle is assumed without question, although it has been disputed of late by several scholars in Holland, Germany, Switzerland, and England. I cannot enter here upon a refutation of their considerations, but I hope to show that the gift of tongues, as it is described in 1 Co 12–14, is a phenomenon conceivable only in the earliest period of the Christian Church, and that, therefore, the Epistle must be genuine.

Likewise the theories advanced also by theologians in Holland, that these chapters contain numerous later interpolations, indeed, are composed of eight separate parts, will be refuted through the essentially unified result to which the investigation will lead. The question whether the fragment towards the end of chap. 14, in which the women are forbidden to speak in the church, is conceivable in the same Epistle with chap. 11, in which prayer and prophecy is generally granted to them, is not one that demands our attention here.

In the inquiry into the essential elements of the speaking with tongues, we must proceed from the fact that Paul everywhere distinguishes it from prophecy. When he makes a general enumeration of the gifts of the Spirit, he names the one as well as the other (12[10. 28]). When he mentions only the two, he places them in contrast with each other (14[1ff. 20ff. 27ff.]). A study of early Christian prophecy will therefore give us a better understanding of the speaking with tongues.

Prophecy is described as edifying, comforting, consoling, as convicting, judging, making manifest the secrets of the heart, and, finally, as instructing (vv.[3. 24f. 31]); but contrary to expectation it never appears as a foretelling of the future. Yet it depends upon immediate Divine revelation, though the recipient need not at once give expression to what he has thus received (vv.[30f.]). Criticism, moreover, is in no way excluded by its super-

natural origin, but, on the contrary, 'the others' (not simply one but the others in general) are to test the statements of the prophet (v.[29]). In every case it is assumed, and in v.[3] expressly stated, that prophecy, for which we should more properly use the name sermon, is universally intelligible.

Just this element, however, is lacking in the speaking with tongues. 'He that speaks in a tongue speaks not unto men, but unto God: for no man understands,' says the apostle (v.[2]); and he illustrates this later by several comparisons: 'Even things without life giving a voice, whether pipe or harp, if they give not a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?' (v.[7]). The simple Greek music was not yet sufficiently advanced to be able to produce definite impressions by means of the bare tone of certain instruments. The Greek, just as the musically uneducated man of to-day, liked to hear familiar melodies, or at least those which would be easily understood; for otherwise he did not comprehend the music. 'For,' continues Paul as proof, 'if the trumpet, which sounds loud enough, give an uncertain voice (that is, an indefinite signal), who shall prepare himself for war?' (v.[8]). The mere sound of the trumpet with which we immediately connect definite impressions, meant nothing to the Greek; he wanted a definite signal. With this light we can now understand more fully the reference we considered earlier: 'If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass or a clanging cymbal' (13[1]). The cymbal, at least, is likewise in modern music only a noise-instrument, which awakens no definite idea. Even of such little account, says Paul, is the very highest form of speaking with tongues, namely, that which is practised by the angels. Further, returning now to chap. 14, we find that he compares the gift with indistinct speaking: 'Unless ye utter by the tongue speech easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?' (v.[9]). The discussion here is not concerning speaking with tongues, for that, according to what has gone before, is *always* indistinct. Paul, rather, likens the indistinct speaking with tongues to indistinct speaking in general—both are unintelligible and useless. And, finally, for the last analogy: 'There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world. If, then, I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaks a barbarian, and he that speaks will be a barbarian unto me' (vv.[10f.]). Paul thus *compares* speaking with tongues with speaking in foreign languages, consequently he regards the two as not the same, and this verifies the conclusions we have already reached as to the meaning of the expression. If, as a last resort, appeal is made to v.[21], where the apostle points out to those in the Corinthian Church, who spoke with tongues, a prophecy regarding the Assyrians, who spoke foreign languages, it is to be said in reply that here, as elsewhere, Paul applies a directly Christian interpretation to the Old Testament, without in any way concerning himself as to the historical sense.

Our investigations, then, so far have proved only that the speaking with tongues was unintelligible. Many, it is true, have desired to draw larger inferences from the references we have discussed, and hold that the speaking with tongues consisted of inarticulate sounds, but in strict interpretation that is not said. Neither can appeal be made to Ro 8[26] where the apostle speaks of 'unutterable groanings,' for these are not designated as speech with tongues. Possibly this speaking assumed that form occasionally; certainly it appeared in another form also. But in order to establish this fact, it is necessary to insert a short further statement. Paul repeatedly contrasts with one another the speaking with tongues and prophecy, and in the same way spiritual gifts and prophecy, or those who are spiritually endowed and prophets (1 Co 14[1. 37]). It is evident from this that he understands under spiritual gifts chiefly the gift of tongues, and under spiritually endowed those who speak with tongues. According to this result, then, the beginning of the entire discussion (12[1f.]) must be interpreted. For this purpose it is all the same if one translates: 'Concerning spiritual gifts,' or better still, in view of what follows, 'concerning those persons who are spiritually endowed, I would not have you ignorant.' In any event, Paul refers to those who spoke with tongues when he says: 'Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking in the Spirit of God says, Jesus is anathema; and no man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit' (v.[3]). Here at all events those who spoke with tongues uttered intelligible words, though of so curious a nature that we must necessarily later return once again to this reference.

In the present connexion, appeal for proof of the result we have just reached might perhaps be

also made to the fact that the speaking with tongues was often interpreted by others. For this is indicated by the mention of both the interpretation and the speaking with tongues, in the enumeration of the spiritual gifts with which different persons were endowed (12[8ff.]), and then by the corresponding questions: 'Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?' (v.[30]). In particular, it is proved by the development towards the end of chap. 14. When in v.[26] we read: 'When you come together, each one has a psalm, has a teaching, has a revelation, has a tongue, has an interpretation' (to offer), a more exact rendering would be this: 'Each one has something different, the one this, the other that.' But then further: 'If any man speaks in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most three, and that in turn; and let one interpret: but if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church' (vv.[27f.]). Here the interpreter cannot be one of those who speak in a tongue. At least then he must interpret also what is spoken by the others, since none shall remain without interpretation. But if this were so, it would certainly have been stated. It is simpler, therefore, to distinguish 'the one' from those who speak with tongues. Finally, why only one is to interpret, while the prophets may be criticized by 'the others' generally, is easy to divine: probably otherwise different interpretations might easily have arisen. For it is to be remembered that speaking in a tongue was for the most part unintelligible; even if one understood particular words or sentences, their connexion at least must have been obscure, if not, perhaps it was the case that even absolutely senseless combinations of sounds alternated with the intelligible words and sentences.

But how, then, was an interpretation possible at all? Perhaps practice and familiarity with the matter enabled some to interpret simultaneously the speaker's face expressions and gestures. Only thus could the congregation, as appears to be presupposed, also respond with 'Amen' to a speech in a tongue which they understood only in places; while, on the other hand, the uninitiated and unbelieving, unacquainted with these phenomena, must have designated them as madness (vv.[16. 23]).

But how did such a manner of speaking come into existence at all? It is sometimes thought that the Corinthians wished to speak a new language, because their mother tongue was not sufficient to express their feelings. But ignoring the certainty of opposition from Paul to such a desire, it is decisive against the theory that those who spoke with tongues were without clear consciousness, and therefore could not have this aim in view. The apostle explicitly says (v.[14]): 'If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my understanding is unfruitful' (or inactive). Those who spoke in a tongue were therefore in a state of ecstasy, and gave immediate expression to their feelings in phrases which must have been in the main unintelligible to the others.

From this fact the remarkable reference (12[3]) considered above can also be explained. Here the entire distinction which Paul makes for the Corinthians is based on the assumption that some members of the Church really said, 'Jesus is anathema,' as others said, 'Jesus is Lord.' These outcries did not occur, however, during persecution, because in reality we hear nothing of this, neither in learned discussions concerning the relation of the earthly Jesus to the heavenly Christ, for of such at this time we know even less; but they occurred in speaking with tongues, which is the only subject under discussion in this connexion. Those who spoke with tongues must have often uttered cries like this one, 'Jesus is anathema,' without really wishing to curse Jesus, for in general Paul designates speaking in a tongue as prayer, singing of praises, blessing, and giving of thanks (14[14ff.]). These cries are, then, only to be explained as unconscious utterances.

We are therefore in a position to understand why the speakers could not on the whole, as we have seen, interpret their own speeches. They had of their condition only a general remembrance, by which nevertheless they could be strengthened in the faith (v.[4]).

However, many must have remained in possession of their senses in a larger measure, so that they could afterwards interpret their own speeches. That is manifestly assumed in the words further on: 'I would have you all speak with tongues, but rather that ye should prophesy: and greater is he that prophesies than he that speaks with tongues, except he interpret' (v.[5]). In a still later reference Paul even desires that everyone who speaks in a tongue pray that he may also interpret (v.[13]).

Our investigation yields, therefore, the following conclusions: The speaking with tongues occurred in ecstasy, and was in general unintelligible. There

were differences in the case of different individuals, and even of the same individual at different times. Sometimes a man was conscious to such an extent that he afterwards remembered his utterances; but at other times he had so entirely lost control of his senses that he gave to his feelings an expression exactly contrary to their content. If, in addition to this, we may suppose that with these unconnected words and sentences, meaningless sound-combinations alternated, then some additional light will be thrown upon the apostle's expression, 'Kinds of tongues' (12[10]).

But why does he speak at all of 'tongues'? This question could have been correctly answered long ago, if it had not been asked almost universally too soon. Just as in numerous other questions, so also here, it has been customary first to examine the meaning of the words used in the expression, and after that to explain the description of the matter itself. Had the process rather been reversed, most of the interpretations of the expression under consideration would at the very beginning have proved themselves impossible.

That this is true of the explanation, 'to speak in foreign languages,' we have already seen. It holds good also for the translation, 'to speak in a new language,' to prove which it is not even legitimate to cite Is 50[4], Lk 21[15], or Rev 13[5], since in all these references the tongue or the mouth which is given to the prophet, the apostle, or the beast, is more exactly described. As little ought one to translate, 'speak with the tongue,' as if by 'tongue' the human organ were to be understood. For thus, then, the characteristic fact that it is a special speaking with the tongue would not be expressed. Or, would a speaking which was effected *by the Spirit* have been designated simply as a speaking *with the tongue*? Then at least (as in the reference of another nature (14[19]), which has been considered above), the article (with *the* tongue) would have been used, and with reference to a single person, the plural (in ton*gues*) would not have been used as it is in the case in 14[5f. 18]. And, finally, what sense would there be in saying, 'the one has a tongue' (v.[26]), if this expression is to be understood as referring to the tongue as a human organ? Much more accordant with these quotations is the explanation of 'tongues' as archaic expressions or unintelligible sayings. For in this latter sense was the Greek word used, not only in educated, but also in uneducated circles. But, nevertheless, even this explanation is insufficient. If Paul, without comment, called that *ecstatic* speech a speaking with tongues, the expression must have been already in use just for such phenomena, and, therefore, the thing itself must have been known earlier.

In fact, at the beginning of his entire discussion, the apostle himself contrasts the speaking with tongues with similar phenomena in heathen environment: 'Ye know that when ye were Gentiles ye were led away unto those dumb idols (by the demons, since they stood behind the idols), howsoever ye might be led (that is, involuntarily)' —but now ye should be able so far to control yourselves as not to cry in ecstasy, 'Jesus is anathema' (12[2f.]). We do not know, indeed, what form of heathen ecstasy Paul had especially in mind. Perhaps it was the madness of the priests of Cybele and Bacchus, who were as a matter of fact worshipped in Attica and Achaia. It is even possible that Paul's comparison of speaking in tongues with sounding brass and a clanging cymbal (13[1]) was derived from the use of these instruments in the worship just mentioned. If finally a step further may be taken, it is conceivable that the Christian speaking with tongues had sometimes taken the form of wild and disorderly howling, such as was uttered by the Corybantes in their processions—but this is in no way certain.

Still less may we suppose that the speaking with tongues was similar in kind to certain Gnostic prayers published lately, for the enigmatical words of which these prayers largely consist are names of gods whose existence was first supposed in Egypt. 'About the middle of the nineteenth dynasty the discovery was made there that the most efficacious names of gods consisted in absolutely senseless combinations of letters. In books of conjuring, as well as in books of the dead, and in scientific works, the most abundant use of this acquisition has since been made, until far down into Christian times.' But the speaking with tongues of the early Christians was, as we have seen, nothing artificial, but something throughout natural.

For this reason, both now and formerly, comparisons have been made with similar phenomena of religious excitement in recent times. Thus the speech of the Camisards at the end of the

seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries consisted very often of inarticulate sounds or newly created words, which, however, were supposed to belong to unknown languages, or were explained artificially from foreign sources. A member of the sect himself described his state in the following manner: 'I always felt in this state an extraordinary elevation to God, before whom I therefore swear that I have neither been dazzled nor misled by any man, nor induced through worldly considerations to utter throughout any other words than those formed by the Spirit or the angel of God himself, who at this time made use of my organs of speech. To Him alone I surrender during my ecstasy the guidance of my tongue, while I strive only to turn myself towards God and to take note of the words which my mouth utters. I know that then a higher and another Power speaks through me. I do not think over it afterwards, nor do I know beforehand what I shall speak. My words come to me as the speech of another, but they leave a deep impression in my memory.'

Quite similar was the fanatical movement which arose among the Jansenists of France in 1731, and expressed itself among other ways also in the unintelligible speaking of those who were affected by it. They believed, just as the Camisards did, that their organs of speech were controlled by another power, so that they were not conscious of their words until they heard themselves utter them. At times they retained their full consciousness, and after the ecstasies were over, remembered exactly all they had done and spoken, so that they could correct and complete their speeches which were written down by the hearers. However, after the paroxysms were over, in most cases they were in absolute ignorance, or had only very incomplete knowledge of what they had spoken. They also often made use of entirely senseless sound-combinations, which were regarded as words from foreign languages.

This latter form of ecstasy appeared again in this century in the 'forties,' in the so-called '*sermon-sickness*' in Sweden. Inarticulate sounds alternated with the unconscious singing of hymns, and the preaching of sermons for repentance. A recollection of what had been said scarcely ever remained. There we find also exact analogies to that cry of the Corinthians, 'Jesus is anathema'; for in many of those who were attacked, the sermon-sickness expressed itself at first in horrible oaths.

Least of all should I like to compare the Corinthian speaking with tongues with the phenomenon with which many are accustomed directly to compare it, viz. the speaking with tongues among the Irvingites, for this phenomenon was from the very beginning artificial. Prayer was offered that God might again give to the new apostolic Church the gifts of the old. Among these was included the gift of tongues, by which was naturally understood speaking in foreign languages. One day a young girl really did begin to speak in a foreign language, which she herself did not recognize. Her words were written down and sent to every available linguist, Dr. Pusey among others, with the inquiry if it were perhaps Hebrew. As a matter of course, no one knew the unknown language; they were only senseless combinations of sound, at first voluntarily, and then involuntarily produced. Later, the speech of others who believed that they had received the same gift, was found to contain as a matter of fact single words from foreign languages which they understood. Afterwards also the remainder was in the most artificial manner explained, as being English, Latin, Italian, or French.

That in Corinth, likewise, the inarticulate outcries of those who spoke with tongues (if such occurred at all) were explained in this manner, is scarcely probable. The opinion has indeed been advanced that 'Abba' was at first heard in a speech with tongues, and on this account later came into use, but it is just as easy to believe that it was directly borrowed from the Jews. Still less may we regard 'Maranatha' as the artificial explanation of a senseless combination of sounds. The Aramaic prayer-cry, 'Our Lord, come!' appears, on the contrary, to have been used as a sign of recognition, which, however, people soon ceased to be able to understand. It is possible that this or similar expressions from foreign languages occurred in speaking with tongues, but they certainly did not arise from a love for their foreign origin. For the Corinthian speaking with tongues was not, I repeat, anything artificial, but something thoroughly natural, and for this reason the Epistle which describes it must without doubt belong to the earliest time.

Just in the same manner now we must conceive of the miracle at Pentecost, and the speaking with

tongues both of Cornelius and of the disciples of John. The wonderful inspiration, without which the first followers of Jesus would never have come into publicity, expressed itself at first, if not in inarticulate sounds, yet in unconnected words and sentences. Nevertheless, the disciples at least were masters of their excitement to such an extent, that they became silent when Peter began to speak. In the same way also Paul sought to restrict as much as possible the ecstatic element in the gift of tongues in Corinth. He had a difficult position in dealing with the phenomenon. On the one hand he had to thank God for it, because he could see in it the direct proof of the efficacy of his preaching to the Corinthians. Moreover, according to 1 Co 13^1, he attributed the gift of tongues to the angels also — why, then, should he not rejoice when men performed like deeds? And therefore he forbade anyone to stop speaking with tongues (14^{39}), as for the same purpose he had written to the Thessalonians: 'Quench not the Spirit' (1 Th 5^{19}). But even this very expression of his sounds rather unemphatic, and much more so do others. At the close of the twelfth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, when he enumerates the different gifts which God has given to the Church, the preceding context would lead one to expect that he would continue somewhat in this manner: 'So each one with the gift he has received may serve the whole Church.' But instead of this we read, 'Desire earnestly the greater gifts,' and among these, according to what follows, speaking with tongues at all events is not included. And even the greater gifts of grace are not the greatest. While he dictates these words, it occurs to the apostle that love is nobler than the gifts of which he had been writing. So he stops a moment as though meditating, and then continues triumphantly: 'And a still more excellent way show I unto you.' Thus follows in chap. 13 the Psalm about love, beginning with the words cited already several times: 'If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal.' Even in its highest form, then, speaking with tongues is worthless if love is not added. Therefore, returning to his proper theme in the beginning of chap. 14, he says: 'Follow after love, yet desire earnestly spiritual gifts (such as speaking with tongues), but rather that you may prophesy.' Speaking with tongues is thus placed below prophecy. Moreover, farther on Paul says of himself: 'In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue' (v.^{19}). And, again, in v.^{26} he says: 'Let all things be done unto edifying' (comp. 12^7), the context showing that he has the edification of others in mind. According, then, to this principle, Paul must have rated very low that speaking with tongues which did not serve this purpose. In fact, he seeks (vv.$^{21f.}$) to prove from the previously quoted reference in Isaiah, that speaking with tongues was intended as a sign to the *unbelieving*, since they would be sure to regard it as madness, and so would not be converted. He exhorts the Corinthians, on the other hand, to be not children in mind, but of full age (v.^{20}); in other words, they were especially proud of their ability to speak with tongues, but still Paul designates it as childish. Paul's attitude, therefore, authorizes for us the maintenance of the conclusion we have already reached. Speaking with tongues was a child's complaint, but such a form of illness as could be exceedingly dangerous to Christianity. Among the Camisards, the Jansenist convulsionists, the 'sermon-sick,' or even among the Irvingites, we have just an example of what the young Christianity might have become if Paul had not taken steps to prevent its degeneration into this form. If on this account the early Christian Church may seem to many less great, Paul appears to us so much the greater.

It is true, it might be said, that that high-grade excitement was naturally temporary, and that along with it speaking with tongues must also have spontaneously disappeared. But that is just what is very questionable. Possibly the attempt would have been made to use artificial means for its sustenance, but then the phenomenon would really have become what in Goethe's opinion it was from the very first. To quote him: 'They shut themselves up in themselves, stopped the clear flow of the living teaching, in order to raise the water to its first height, then brooded with their own spirit over the darkness and moved upon the deep. In vain! This artificially produced power could bring forth nothing but dark presentiments. They stammered them out, no one understood them, and so they wasted the best time of the meeting.' That this was *not* the

case must therefore have been due to another cause, and that was, in fact, the opposition of St. Paul.

Nowhere in Paul's later Epistles do we find any mention of speaking with tongues; and the same is the case in the post-Pauline writings. We read, it is true, once more in Eph 5^{18}, 'Be not drunken with wine, but be filled with the Spirit,' but this has reference more particularly to the prophets. After a short time the nature of speaking with tongues was so little remembered, that though it was indeed not confounded with speaking in foreign languages, yet both could be associated as if they were similar in kind. Thus arose that conception of the miracle at Pentecost which now lies before us in Ac 2, and which has really a deep and true meaning. Will it not be true, indeed, in the future, that all peoples—those also of whom nothing was known at that time—will hear in their own language the proclamation of the mighty works of God? The author of the conclusion to Mark's Gospel, whether Aristion or some other, had also no definite conception of the speaking with tongues, and, as we have seen, Irenæus had just as little. Tertullian, on the other hand, knew of the phenomenon in its montanistic form, which we can now say resembled that of the early Christians. It was, perhaps, even superior to the latter, in that the montanistic oracles, although spoken in ecstasy, and in parts needing explanation, yet as far as the individual words were concerned, appear to have been intelligible. That could not always have been the case with the speaking with tongues. Nevertheless, the Church has rejected this reaction, and rightly, for this rejection is but the application of Paul's axiom: 'God is not a God of confusion, but of peace' (1 Co 14^{33}).

In conclusion, if our preachers should wish to speak again with tongues in the old way, not only the uninitiated and unbelieving, but also the best Christians would certainly say, 'Ye are mad.'

The Antediluvian Patriarchs.

By A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

In the *Sunday School Times* for 31st December 1898, Professor Hommel has an interesting article on 'The Story of Cain and Abel,' in which he points out that, while Abel represents the Semitic nomad shepherds, Cain stands for the cultured population of the Sumerian cities of ancient Babylonia. Cain is, in fact, 'the smith,' and, as I pointed out many years ago, the Cainites, or Kenites, were the tribe, or caste, of wandering smiths, among whom the secrets of the craft were handed down from father to son. The Assyrian equivalent of Cain is *Ummanu*.

The tinkers are still a wandering caste in the East, as they were in Europe during the Middle Ages. This will explain how it is that though Cain represents the settled Sumerian people of Babylonia, he can yet be described as a 'fugitive and a vagabond.' Can the 'mark' that was set upon him be a tattoo-mark peculiar to the caste?

Seth, who took the place of Abel, is a duplicate of the latter. He is the *Sutu* of the cuneiform monuments, the *Satiu* of the Egyptian inscriptions, that is to say, the Semitic nomads of the deserts between Egypt and Babylonia, and of the plateau of Mesopotamia. The name must go back to the period when the ancestors of the Babylonians and Egyptians had not yet separated from one another, and when the wheat of Babylonia was being introduced into the valley of the Nile.

I believe that the Egyptian god Set—or rather, Sutu, as the Tel el-Amarna tablets show the name should be read—is merely the 'Sutu' god. At all events, Set was the god of the desert in which the Semitic nomads lived, and the name of the goddess, Satit, at the First Cataract is written in the same way as that of the Satiu, while her consort, 'Anuqit, is the feminine of the Canaanite god Anak. That the Sutu worshipped an eponymous deity we know from Nu 24^{17}, where they are called 'the children of Sheth,' (just as the Ammonites are called the children of Ammi), and the Assyrian king Samas-Hadad (or Samas-Rimmon) invokes 'the god Sutu-sar,' 'Sutu the king' (*W.A.I.* i. 29, 18.), who is coupled with the god Nabu-rabe, 'Nebo the great,' in a text published by Dr. Scheil (*Z.A.* viii. p. 206). The form 'Nabu-rabe,' it may be added, belongs to

the period of West Semitic influence in Babylonia, in the age of Khammurabi.

The antediluvian patriarchs are ten in number, like the antediluvian kings of Babylonia. This has often been noted, but what has not been observed is that both the patriarchs and the kings fall into three groups, which exactly correspond with one another. The first two Babylonian kings, Aloros and his son Alaparos, came from Babylon; their six successors from 'Pantibibla'; while the two last kings, Opartes (Ubara-Tutu), and his son Xisuthros, the Chaldean Noah, were from 'Larankha,' the Surippak of the cuneiform texts. Similarly, in the Book of Genesis the third and fourth patriarchs are merely a dialectic variation of first and second; in other words, Adam and Cain, for whom Seth is substituted in the Sethite genealogy, belong to the list as it was handed down by one tribe, Enos and Cainan to the list as it was handed down by another tribe. Adam and Cain (or Seth) thus stand just as much outside the biblical list as Aloros and Alaparos do outside the Babylonian one. The latter were foisted into the Babylonian list at the time when under the dynasty of Khammurabi Babylon first became the capital of Chaldea, and began to claim that the right of sovereignty belonged to it from the first.

This, however, was far from being the case. Babylon was one of the younger cities of Babylonia, and was a colony of Eridu, the seaport on the Persian Gulf, through which the elements of culture first penetrated into the country. The fact was acknowledged even by those who made Aloros of Babylon the first antediluvian king. Berossos tells us that it was from the waters of the Persian Gulf, and not from the Euphrates at Babylon, that Oannes arose each morning, bringing with him a knowledge of the arts and sciences, and consequently it must have been at Eridu and not at Babylon that Babylonian civilization first established itself.

Beings similar to Oannes ascended out of the gulf during the reigns of the six successors of Alaparos. Hence we may infer that the 'Pantibibla' of Berossos must be the Eridu of the inscriptions, however difficult it may be to explain the name. Perhaps it is intended to signify 'the town of books.' At anyrate, while the first two antediluvian kings owe their existence to the vanity of the natives of Babylon, and the last two are derived from the legends of Surippak, the intervening six represent the antediluvian history of Babylonia as it was conceived in the ancient traditions of Eridu.

Now between the six antediluvian kings who belong to the traditions of Eridu and the corresponding biblical patriarchs there is a close relationship in names. The following table will make this clear:—

Babylonia.	Genesis.
3. Amelon (Amilum, 'man')	3. Enos, 'man.'
4. Ammenon (Ummanum, 'smith').	4. Cainan, 'smith.'
5. Megalaros (for Megalalos).	5. Mahalaleel or Mekhuyael (Gn 4^{18}).
6. Daônos, 'the shepherd' of Eridu (*rêum Eridi*).	6. Jared or Irad.
7. Euedor-ankhos.	7. Enoch.
8. Amempsinos (Amil-Sin, 'the man of the moon-god').	8. Methuselakh or Methusael (Mutu-sa-ili, 'the man of the god').

In the list of the Cainites (Gn 4^{18}) Enoch and Mekhuyael (Mahalaleel) are transposed, but this is because Cain is stated to have built the city of Enoch, and it was therefore natural to suppose that Enoch was his son. The name, which is variously written Jared and Irad, seems certainly to be Eridû, 'the native of Eridu.' As for the eighth patriarch, the fact that his name is purely Babylonian (Mutu-sa-ili) and not West Semitic, is very remarkable. The form Methuselakh may be due to a confusion between Mutu-sa-ili and Mutu-sa-irkhu, 'the man of the moon-god' (cf. the name of the king of Hamath, Irkhulena, 'the moon-god is our god').

With the eighth patriarch the list of Eridu closes, and the correspondence between the genealogies of the Sethites and Cainites on the one hand, and the biblical patriarchs and the Babylonian kings on the other, comes to an end. Lamech, whatever the name may mean, bears no relationship to Ubara-Tutu, 'the minister of the god Tutu,' whom the traditions of Surippak made the father of the Chaldean Noah, ascribing to the latter the translation to heaven, which in the Book of Genesis (and probably also in the traditions of Eridu) was ascribed to Enoch.

The name of Noah, however, must go back to the age of Khammurabi, when, as we now learn from the cuneiform inscriptions, names of West Semitic origin terminated in the mimmation. In Gn 5^{29} it is derived from נחם, 'to comfort,' implying that it terminated in *-m*, and was accordingly pronounced Nukhum.

A. H. Sayce.

Dahabia 'Istar,' Assuan.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS xiii. 10–12.

'And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the Plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou goest unto Zoar. So Lot chose him all the Plain of Jordan; and Lot journeyed east: and they separated themselves the one from the other. Abram dwelled in the land of Canaan, and Lot dwelled in the cities of the Plain, and moved his tent as far as Sodom' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'The Plain of Jordan.'—This word, *Ciccar*, literally means the *circuit*, or, as it is translated in Mt 3^5, 'the region round about Jordan,' and, according to Col. Conder (*Tent Work*, ii. p. 14), is the proper name of the Jordan valley, and especially of the plain of Jericho. It is now called the Ghor, or *depression*, and is one of the most remarkable districts in the world, being a deep crack or fissure, with chalk rocks upon the western and sandstone on the eastern side, over which lies limestone, geologically of the age of our greensand formation. It is thus what is technically called by miners a fault, the formations on the two sides having been displaced by some tremendous convulsion of nature. Most of the valley lies below the level of the Mediterranean, the Sea of Galilee being, by Col. Conder's observations, about 682 feet below it, and the Dead Sea no less than 1292 feet. As the watershed to the south rises to a level of 200 feet above the Mediterranean, all egress for the waters is thereby cut off, and there are numerous proofs that at some distant period the whole valley, about 150 miles in length, was a succession of large lakes. But even in Abram's days the Jordan poured down a far larger volume of water than at present; for by the loss of its forests the climate of Palestine has become much more dry than of old, and regions once fertile are now barren. And as the supply of water has become less than that lost by evaporation, the Dead Sea has gradually receded, and left around it arid wastes covered over with incrustations of salt.—PAYNE SMITH.

'Like the land of Egypt.'—The irrigation of Egypt was effected by a most laborious process, and often by the application of machines trod with the foot. But if the soil has thus been carefully *watered*, it assumes in a short time the rich aspect of a garden, and generally rewards the husbandman with the most abundant harvest.—KALISCH.

'As thou goest unto Zoar.'—*In the direction of So'ar*, on the south-east shore of the Dead Sea. This determines the southern extremity of the region so resplendent in the beauty and wealth of its plant life, and therefore belongs to the whole sentence and not to the land of Egypt alone.—DILLMANN.

'Abram dwelled in the land of Canaan.'—Strictly so called; in its larger sense Canaan included the circle of the Jordan.—WHITELAW.

'Lot dwelled in the cities of the Plain.'—Not as yet within their walls, but in their neighbourhood, and evidently with a longing 'towards Sodom,' where in chap. 19 we find him sitting in the gate as a citizen, and with his tent changed to a house. While, then, Abram continued to lead a hardy life on the bracing hills, Lot sighed for the less self-denying habits of the city; and probably, when he had descended into the Ghor, the enervating climate, which so developed the sensual vices of the people as to make them 'sinners before Jehovah,' disposed Lot also to quit his tent, and yield himself to a luxurious and easy manner of living.—PAYNE SMITH.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

A Worldly Choice and its Consequences.

By the Rev. John Ker, D.D.

THAT Lot was a good man in the ground of his character there is no reason to doubt. But good men have their besetting sins. Lot's was worldliness, and it cost him dear. Consider some features of Lot's choice.

1. Worldly advantage was the chief element in it. Asceticism is no feature of the Bible, but to make outward advantage the main object in choosing our path in life is not the guidance of God's Word. Wealth is not the one thing needful. The acquisition of money is one of the first things men think of in choosing a profession, but a man cannot with impunity disregard his natural capacities and his duty in order to be rich. Lot clung to Sodom till he had to be driven forth by God's destroying angel.

2. It showed want of generosity. Lot took advantage of Abraham's offer to take the richest side, possibly congratulating himself on his own shrewdness. Too many so-called Christians snatch at every favour and take advantage of men of generous nature. They are the most unsatisfactory of all friends, paining us constantly by their selfishness, and failing us in the hour of need.

3. It showed disregard of religious privileges. He knew the wickedness of Sodom, and if his religion had been bright and warm, he would not

have ventured there. He may have soothed his conscience by saying he would do good there, but he who enters a den of wickedness merely for worldly profit is not likely to make a good missionary, and when Lot left Sodom he had not made a single convert.

The Consequences of Lot's Choice—

1. As he aimed at worldly advantage, he failed in gaining it. A man may do so and succeed, but if he is a child of God and in danger of losing his soul from worldly temptations, his salvation may lie in failure, and that failure may arise from the compromise he is attempting. Twice Lot lost all his possessions, and as he would not leave Sodom of his own free will, God drove him out. God will burn away the cherished sins of His people by the fire of trial.

2. As he failed in generosity to Abraham, he was repeatedly brought under obligations to him. In a few years he owed all he had—family, property, liberty—to Abraham. Again, when Sodom was destroyed, he was rescued at Abraham's intercession. The friend with whom he had dealt so ungenerously fought with men and wrestled with God for him, and in both conflicts, like a prince, he prevailed.

3. His disregard of spiritual privileges brought him sin and shame. His own character and that of his family suffered from evil associations. His life is a warning against worldliness, the most insinuating of sins. One great reason why Christianity makes so little progress is that those who profess to regard religion as all-important, subordinate it to worldly advantage in considering education, friendships, and alliances. Both worlds frequently slip from the grasp in the attempt to gain the false glitter of the present.

II.

Lot's Choice.

By the late Archbishop Trench, D.D.

When Abraham began his pilgrimage to the land of promise he took Lot as his companion. It was a great honour and privilege for Lot, as it always is for us to live in close familiarity with one nobler than ourselves. What use did Lot make of this opportunity?

The first occasion for a display of Lot's character was that of the strife between the herdsmen. They must part to find room for their cattle. Abraham gives Lot his choice of the land, and without reluctance he chooses the best he can see. It was a selfish choice.

There were other blemishes in the choice. He pitched his tent *towards Sodom*. For the sake of gain he planted himself and his family among a people sunk in sin. But in his haste to be rich the riches escape him. He is carried away with all that he has along with the people of Sodom, and is only rescued by Abraham.

Still this is not enough. He persists in his choice and establishes himself again in Sodom, where all seems prosperous once more, though the cup of its iniquity is full. There are righteous men whose presence is a restraint on the wicked, but Lot is not one of these. He has no influence with the people. When he warns them of danger he seems to his sons-in-law to mock, and even his wife does not believe him. He himself can scarcely be torn away from the material things to which his soul clings. He escapes with his life only. All is gone which he got by preferring himself to Abraham, and by taking up his abode with the wicked. With the brand of dishonour on his brow he disappears from sacred story.

We see in his life the faithfulness of God, which will not leave us in our sins to the saddest of dooms—the unpunished prosperity of the wicked. But God's chastisement does not always accomplish its work. If Lot were saved, it was as by fire. Would we wish to be saved like this, with graces stunted as his, no service done for others, no glory to God, cast naked and shivering like shipwrecked mariners on the shores of everlasting life? Let us choose the better part in another sense than Lot's, and turn our backs betimes on the doomed and guilty city of this world.

Illustrations.

The story of Lot may be described as an epitome of life. Just as evolution asserts that in the structure of man every type of created life is represented, so it may be said that every man epitomizes in himself all the moral forces that make the tragedy or the triumph of life. The passing of thousands of years makes absolutely no difference to the problem: the story of Lot is as human, as real, as vital, as though it happened yesterday, and, indeed, there is no day when it is not being reacted in human lives. Lot was offered a choice in life, and he chose wrongly—with what a harvest of disastrous consequences we all know. To us also come solemn hours of choice, when a destiny depends upon

the decision of an instant. Lot obeyed an inclination rather than a principle; we also are under the constant temptation to guide our course by the lower rather than the higher dictates of our nature. It is only in such terrible hours of choice that the true bias of our nature is apt to reveal itself, just as no one suspects the bias in the ball until it is set rolling. And the bias does not count for much when the ball begins to move; it is not until the distance grows that we perceive what the goal will be.—W. J. DAWSON.

HIGH up amid the mountain ranges of the Black Forest, in Germany, you may see a number of tiny streams trickling down over the rough rocks and through the dark woods; small at first—so small that the broken branch of a tree or small fragment of stone, fallen from the overhanging crag, may divert it to the right hand or the left. It seems a little matter indeed which course the stream follows, as it sings its happy way down the mountain side, rippling and sparkling in the summer sunshine; but just that turn decides whether it is to flow with the streams below which unite to form the Danube, or with those which make the Rhine—whether, in fact, it is to pass on and on through the warmer climes to a southern sea, or to empty itself at last into the cold waters of the north.—J. T. SHORE.

PERHAPS I speak to some who are just about to choose for themselves a business or profession. Take care lest you fall into the same pit as Lot. Before you turn your face to Sodom and Gomorrah—to the promising situation in London or Glasgow—learn about something more than the well-watered plain. There may be a good wage and better prospects, but if they are only to be had at the price Lot paid for them, you had better break stones on the roadside. There are professions in life in themselves honourable enough, yet for some so beset with dangers, that they will do well to think not twice only, but twenty times before they embark in them.—G. JACKSON.

THE tempter will never propose that you should go by a single journey from Bethel to Sodom. He will ask you at first only to look upon the well-watered plain, then to choose it, then to go down into it, and he will be quite satisfied for the present if you only pitch your tent *toward* Sodom.—M. NICHOLSON.

ON the moors of Yorkshire there is a stream of water which goes by the name of the 'Ochre Spring.' It rises high up in the hills, and runs on bright and sparkling for a short distance, when it suddenly becomes a dark and muddy yellow. What is the reason of this? It has been passing through a bed of ochre, and so it flows on for miles, useless and unpleasant. The world is full of such beds of ochre. Enter not in the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men.—*Church of England Teachers' Magazine.*

ST. BERNARD, the son of a Knight of Burgundy, having devoted himself to a monastic life, persuaded four brothers, of whom the two elder were, like their father, stout fighting men, to follow his example. Only the youngest remained for a secular life, and he was but a child. As they were finally leaving the paternal castle, one of them said to the boy, 'Nivard, you are now owner of all our property.' 'What?' replied the boy, 'you have heaven and I the earth; that is no fair division.'

Sermons for Reference.

Dawson (W. J.), The Comrade Christ, 243.
Jackson (G.), First Things First, 63.
Ker (J.), Sermons, i. 70.
Mills (B. F.), God's World, 171.
Newman (J. H.), Parochial Sermons, iii. 1.
Nicholson (M.), Communion with Heaven, 171.
Trench (R. C.), Sermons New and Old, 258.

The Temptation of Christ.

BY THE REV. ALFRED E. GARVIE, B.A., B.D., MONTROSE.

II.

THE conclusion of our first inquiry into the value and the source of the records of the temptation of Jesus may be summed up in Weiss' words: 'This account must have stood in the apostolic source. If we are not to regard such an account as a myth, or a pure fiction, we can trace it back only to a communication made by Jesus Himself, seeing that it treats of events that befell Him in the loneliness of the desert' (*Life of Christ*, i. 339). How are we to interpret this communication? must we take the narratives literally, or may we understand them symbolically? (1) In the first place, let it be noted that the purpose of Jesus in reporting this personal experience to His disciples must have been didactic. We do not find in the Gospels a trace of the conceit and vanity in Jesus, which leads some men, otherwise great, to make known to the world all they think, feel, do. Whatever He told others about Himself was for their enlightenment. The disciples were beset by certain moral dangers; they were prone to indulge some false hopes; they were sometimes doubtful about the wisdom and the rightness of the plan of work adopted and followed by Jesus. It

was needful that these dangers should be clearly pointed out to them, that they should be led to abandon these hopes, and that they should be brought to understand and sympathize with their Master's method and purpose of action. How could this be done most quickly and surely? By letting them know that their wishes, hopes, plans, were not new to Jesus, had been already pressed on His acceptance, and had been rejected as sinful temptations. But that the lesson might be taught them it was not at all needful that the facts should be stated with prosaic literalness. It is not at all unlikely that had Jesus presented the temptations to which He had been exposed, in the disguised, subtle, and plausible forms in which He Himself had experienced them, the less sensitive consciences and duller moral intuition of His disciples would not have recognized therein any temptation. It was needful for Jesus to bring the temptations down from the high moral level, in which His inner life moved, down to the low moral level, in which He still found His disciples. The necessity of such a translation of His personal experience into modes of thought and feeling and desire, intelligible to, and real for, His disciples being admitted, the question remains, How could this best be done?

(1) Jesus in teaching the multitudes, and even His disciples, found it needful to use figurative language. Not only in His deeds, but in His words also, was 'truth embodied in a tale that it might enter in at lowly doors.' His parables lodged in the memory, quickened the understanding, and cast a spell over the feelings of His hearers. The most powerful as well as the most charming mode of utterance is the poetical. Jesus was a poet as well as a thinker. It was natural, and not only convenient for Him to speak in symbols. There can be no doubt that in didactic utterances, that which is most effective in producing the impression required is always preferable and justifiable. If Jesus had intended to give His disciples materials for a biography, assuredly it would have been right for Him to report the temptations literally. But any such aim was far from His thoughts. He wanted to teach a lesson, and He was right in choosing the mode of utterance that was sure to prove most effective. Reverence for, and loyalty to, Jesus do not require us to accept the narratives of the temptation literally.

(2) But, in the next place, it is to be noted that the narratives taken literally involve many assumptions, difficult to admit even for those who most heartily believe in the possibility of miracles. Some may find it easy to believe that the devil (the question of the personality of the evil principle need not here be raised) can take to himself a bodily form when and where he will; but such an assumption will seem incredible to those who think that a credulous superstition is a more real and present danger to Christian faith than a sceptical rationalism. Again, it is incredible that the devil could miraculously remove Jesus from the wilderness, first to the pinnacle of the temple, then to the top of a high mountain; that omnipotence belongs to God alone is surely a fundamental principle of ethical monotheism. Still less credible is the assumption that God put forth His power to set Jesus on the pinnacle of the temple, and then on the top of the mountain, and so afforded the tempter his opportunity, for God is not the servant of the devil. Again, where is the mountain from which all the world can be seen in a moment of time? Miracles making void the limitations of time and space are not possible for the devil. If we cannot take these details literally, the safe course is to recognize that the whole narrative is symbolical, for the attempt to combine historical with figurative elements can only lead to confusion, to arbitrary selection, and artificial explanation.

(3) Thirdly, an objection against regarding the narrative as symbolic needs to be met. It is often assumed that the reality of the temptation depends on the literalness of the narratives. So far is this from being the case that the literal interpretation of the narrative makes the temptation a theatrical display instead of a genuine moral experience. A personal devil present in visible form has not the seductive power which a mental suggestion which is not at once recognized as satanic has. Turning stones into bread, casting oneself down from the pinnacle of a temple, and bowing down to Satan, however great the prize offered, are too apparent and too impudent proposals of evil to be dangerous to a sensitive moral nature. The mere quotation of a passage of Scripture is a method of disposing of a temptation which can be effective only where there is no serious moral conflict. As has already been said, Jesus translated His experience for the benefit of His disciples into forms intelligible and real to them. Theirs were moral natures, coarse-fibred, half-finished, not yet sensitive

nor mature. His was a moral insight so keen, a moral integrity so strong, a moral passion so intense, that the temptations must have come to Him in forms far more disguised than the literal explanation of the narrative offers; and His conflict with evil must have been much more varied and strenuous than the simple repetition of texts of Scripture. We do not honour Jesus by assuming that He was capable of being tempted by any of the three forms of temptation taken literally; assuredly the disciples might have been, and for that reason Jesus reported His personal experience in this symbolic form.

Again, it has been said that the suggestions of evil must have come to Jesus from without: they could not come to Him as sinless from within; and accordingly it is assumed there must have been an external personal tempter. This is an example of a psychology too simple for truth. 'The without' and 'the within' of a man's moral personality are not convertible with outside or inside his body. There are contents in every man's memory, instincts and impulses in his heart, and influences over his will which are not of his own making, over which he has not complete control, and for which he cannot be held personally responsible. Jesus did not live in moral isolation, with a moral vacuum in His spirit. Sinless He was, but not on that account incapable of being tempted from within, for in Him as in other men there were thoughts, feelings, wishes, not of His own making, not yet proved sinful, the raw material out of which in due season temptations might be made.

The International Critical Commentary on 'Samuel.'[1]

By the Rev. J. A. Selbie, M.A., Maryculter.

'The International Critical Commentary' series has long ago gained for itself the highest reputation. Not only from England and America but from the Continent has abundant testimony been borne to the exact scholarship and scientific methods it exhibits, as well as to its practical use for all who desire to learn the true meaning of Scripture. In the department of the Old Testament the work before us has been preceded by Driver's *Deuteronomy* and Moore's *Judges*. Both these commentaries had to deal with books of no ordinary difficulty, and both by universal confession have executed their task with brilliant success. It was no light undertaking for Professor H. P. Smith to produce a work that must, as a matter of course, challenge comparison with them. He evidently felt this, for in his Preface he remarks: 'In preparing the present number of the series I have constantly had occasion to admire the work of these predecessors, and I shall be gratified if the present volume shall be found worthy of a place by the side of theirs.'

[1] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel.* By Henry Preserved Smith, Professor of Biblical History and Interpretation in Amherst College. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899. Price, 12s.

Hitherto we have had no scientific English commentary on *Samuel*. Much has been done for the text (which disputes with Ezekiel the claim to be the most corrupt in the O.T.) by Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Budde, and Driver. The latter scholar, indeed, gives us in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* much that is of exegetical value as well, and to some of us the work just named has almost supplied the place of a commentary. It is unfortunate, considering the importance of the Books of Samuel as sources for the history of Israel, that the text should often be so uncertain and that the analysis into sources should present such difficulties. In dealing with these perplexing problems Professor Smith appears to us to exhibit the very ideal of the critical spirit. He handles thorny questions with caution but without timidity.

In his Introduction our author treats summarily but sufficiently (1) *the Title*: pointing out how what was originally one book came to be divided into two, and noting by the way the infelicity of the title *Samuel*, seeing that the prophet just named ceases to be prominent after the middle of the first book; (2) *the Contents*: which deal with a period comprising probably about 100 years,

during which the transition from the tribal to the monarchical form of government was accomplished. The three great figures round which the history is grouped are of course, Samuel, Saul, and David, although to the theocratic view Saul is of minor importance, and the history really belongs to Samuel and David. For practical purposes Professor Smith finds it convenient to arrange the material in three sections (*A*) The Life of Samuel, 1 S 1–15, (*B*) Saul and David, 1 S 16–2 S 1, (*C*) David the king, 2 S 2–24.

(3) The *Composition*.—Here our author notes the well recognized use of duplicate narratives, *e.g.* in the two accounts of Saul's rejection and perhaps of his appointment, of David's introduction to Saul, etc., and points out how a difference of style and of points of view may likewise be traced in different sections. His analysis of the sources will command general approval. It is as follows:—(*A*) 1 S 1–15 consists really of a Life of Samuel, chaps. 1. 3. 4. 7^{3-17} 8. 10^{17-25} 12. 15, and a Life of Saul, 9^{1}–10^{16} 11. 13^{2}–14^{52}. For the former Professor Smith employs the symbol *Sm.*, for the latter *Sl.* The section includes other detached passages that belong to neither of these sources, notably 5^{1}–7^{1}. Chap. 2 is itself composite, but our author sees no reason for holding, with many modern critics, that vv.[27-36] are a very late addition made after the virtual completion of our present book. (*B*) 1 S 16–2 S 1 proceeds from two main sources, which may be a continuation of *Sm.* and *Sl.* The first of these, corresponding to *Sl.*, is 16^{14-23} $18^{6-13.\ 20-29a}$ 19^{11-17} 21^{2-10} $22^{1.\ 2.\ 6-23}$ 23^{1-14} 25. 26. 27. 29. 30. 2 S 1; the second, answering to *Sm.*, is 16^{1-13} 17^{1}–18^{5} (in the LXX text) 18^{14-19} 18^{30}–$19^{10.\ 18-24}$ 21^{11-16} 22^{3-5} 23^{15}–24^{26} 28. 31. Chap. 20 and 21^{1} cannot be fitted into either of these. (*C*) 2 S 2–24, of which chaps. 9–20 are generally admitted to be homogeneous. Perhaps these twelve chapters should be connectedwith *Sl.*, whereas 5. 7. 8 would go better with *Sm.* Chaps. 2–4, again, may belong to *Sl.*, chap. 6 has affinities with both sources. The Appendix, chaps. 21–24, includes diverse sources. Perhaps 21^{1-4} and 24 belong to the same source as 9–20, but could not have been a direct continuation of these chapters, for they interrupt the connexion between 2 S 20 and 1 K 1. Professor Smith has little sympathy with the attempt of Budde and others to trace the Pentateuchal sources J and E in the Books of Samuel. The Deuteronomic touches, also, he holds to be few, and this is generally admitted.

(4) *The Text and Versions*.—Professor Smith describes very carefully the different versions that have to be taken account of, and lays down the principles that must be observed in availing ourselves of their aid. He deals successfully, for instance, with the objection that the text of the LXX is still too corrupt to be used with any certainty in correcting the Massoretic text.

(5) Passing to speak of the *Religious Ideas* of the Books of Samuel, Professor Smith remarks that these are of a mixed character, varying greatly in different sections. A primitive stage, for instance, is marked by the matter-of-course presence of *teraphim* in David's house (1 S 19), whereas elsewhere (15^{22}) the use of these is coupled with idolatry and witchcraft as an abomination to Jahweh. The story of the witch of Endor marks, apparently, a survival of pre-prophetic religion. A limited view of Jahweh, as in the strictest sense the God of Israel alone, appears in 1 S 26^{19}, and even although Jahweh is a righteous God, this attribute is exhibited chiefly in vindicative justice.

The Commentary follows, in its methods, the line now familiar to students of the series. A summary of each paragraph and a general discussion of its meaning is followed by more detailed critical and exegetical notes in small type. After very considerable experience of the employment of this method, as well as of the notation used for scriptural references, not only in these commentaries but in the new *Dictionary of the Bible* and elsewhere, we prefer it to any other with which we are acquainted.

We may note a few of our author's views culled from the pages of the commentary. Professor Smith does not commit himself on the origin or the meaning of 'Belial,' although he has followed, and refers to, the discussions in The Expository Times by Cheyne, Baudissin, and Jensen (p. 11). —The *nabi*, 'prophet,' was probably originally *the mutterer* (p. 72).—The obscure expression in 1 S 15^{32} he renders (but only provisionally) 'Agag came to him trembling, and Agag said, Surely death is bitter.'—As to the story of David's combat with Goliath, he agrees with Robertson Smith in giving the preference to the shorter (LXX) text, but doubts whether Cornill is right in holding that the omitted sections also form a continuous narrative.—He holds that the probabilities are strongly

in favour of David's authorship of the dirge on the death of Saul and Jonathan, building chiefly upon the absence of all religious allusions and of any reference to the strained relations between Saul and David. Such allusions were almost certain to have been introduced by a late imitator. 'The bow' of 2 S 1^{18} Professor Smith despairs of explaining.—In dealing with 2 S 12^{31} he is disposed to acquit David of the charge of torturing his Ammonite prisoners. The words used may mean that David 'set them to the saws and the picks and the axes, and made them work at the brick-moulds.'—2 S 22 (=Ps 18) 'it is difficult to suppose to be David's own.'—2 S 23^{1-7} is 'a comparatively late production.'

These few instances will show the character of the work before us, which, alike in textual criticism, in archæology, in geography, and in exegesis is precisely the kind of commentary to which one turns with confidence.

In the Appendix Professor Smith deals at some length with Löhr's recently published edition of Thenius' *Samuel*, which appeared only after our author's own commentary was in the printer's hands. We feel certain that there will be general agreement amongst scholars that Professor Smith is right in taking Löhr to task for the strangely reactionary method of textual criticism he pursues (cf. also Bertholet's review of Löhr in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, xxiii. (1898), pp. 529 ff. In the same connexion we may refer also to some remarks on textual criticism by Professor Cheyne in the *Expositor*, April 1899, pp. 253 ff.). Löhr may have improved on the commentary proper, but he has certainly altered for the worse a good deal of Thenius' critical work. Finally, our author's excursus on Lucian and Theodotion well deserves, and will no doubt receive, the attention of experts.

It may be safely predicted that Professor Smith's commentary will be welcomed as an accession of strength to the Anglo-American alliance so brilliantly inaugurated by Professors Driver and Moore.

Christ's Sympathy in Life's Commonplace.

(HEBREWS II. 16.)

By the Rev. R. Glaister, B.D., Kirkcudbright.

Great truths are simple truths. Men have strained hard to find the innermost truth of things, and at last have found that it was very simple, lying close to them all the time. God scatters His richest gifts in the greatest profusion. The dewdrop, glancing in the sun, has colours bright as the diamond, and the beauty of things around is better mirrored there. The deepest doctrines of our religion, in exact accordance with God's working elsewhere, are not far-off abstruse thoughts; they come down into the lives of all; they dwell with the simplicities and charities of the universal human heart; they meet the common needs and wants of men. The doctrine of the Incarnation is a high thought, a thought 'pinnacled dim in the intense inane' for the strongest minds to strain after, but the fact of the Incarnation makes religion a dearer and more homely thing. It is a great thing for wise men to explore all nature and the soul of man, to learn what these can tell of Him from whom they came; it is a great thing for wise men to think of a Power behind all visible things, and to ascribe to that Power all the wisdom and beauty and glory they know, and set Him on the shrine of their adoring homage, their spirits' Lord and King; it is a great and high thought for them to people the far-off heavens with ideals of excellence, which may be guides to virtue and happiness for them and all men. That is a religion which exalts our race, begotten as we are of the dust of the ground. Impulse and inspiration for lofty souls may be gotten thence. But our Christian religion, the special gift of our God, is simpler, homelier, warmer; it comes closer to the heart; it leaves the cold bare heights for the valleys where the crowds of men and women are; for it tells us that we need not with lofty persistence scale the

heavens, as God has come down into our hearts, bringing salvation there; it tells us that the Invisible God has broken the silence of ages, and has spoken face to face with men that He might be unto us no God whom we dimly guess at, or whom we long for with a vague unknown yearning, but a God whom we can know and love, and with whom we may live in close communion of heart.

The Incarnation brings to us the priceless blessing of sympathy. The religious life is no longer a life of lonely aspiration, but a life of the warm tender intercourse of love with an ever-present, all-knowing Friend. In trouble, in trial and perplexity, when temptations assail us, and when we fall, and despair is lying in wait for us, we may look to Him who has a fellow-feeling with our infirmities, and find strength and fresh courage in His sympathy. But the sympathy of Jesus reaches farther than that: His companionship is more intimate and more constant. It is in harmony with that tender homely nature of our religion that we should see in the Incarnation the assurance of a sympathy that enters into even the little common needs of every day—a sympathy that embraces all the facts of our life, however trivial and unimportant and secular they may seem.

Christ's sympathy with us in life's commonplace is the fruit of His own experience; it is part of the satisfaction He has of the earthly travail of His soul. For His humiliation was complete. Though He was the Eternal Son of God, yet His life on earth, as the life of One who was really man, was largely taken up with those trivial facts which seem to us unimportant, commonplace. The story in the Gospels fully declares that wondrous fact.

We tell many stories of kings unclothing themselves for a time of their kingly power and rule, and wandering about their realm in the guise of ordinary subjects; but at any time they cast aside their disguise, and resume their old authority. That is no picture of Christ's humiliation. The Incarnation was no mere disguise worn for a season and cast aside at will. Jesus became in very deed man. His heavenly glory was left behind as He stooped to enter the house of our humanity. He came to earth by earth's lowly gateway. He was born the child of an earthly mother. Our women-poets, deep learned in love-lore, have instructed us in that mystery.

No sudden thing of glory and fear
Was the Lord's coming, but the dear
  Slow Nature's days followed each other,
  To form the Saviour from His mother,
One of the children of the year.

The sun, the dews, received the trust,
The wind and rain, to form the Just,
  He drew His daily life from these,
  According to His own decrees,
Who makes man from the fertile dust.

Sweet summer and the winter wild,
These brought Him forth, the undefiled;
  The happy springs renewed again
  His daily bread, the growing grain,
The food and raiment of the child.

So one sings of the completeness of our Lord's submission to all earthly conditions. And another sister-poet, with less subtlety of thought, but with a simplicity that is deeper, and which touches a higher truth, tells us not only that Jesus stooped to wear the form of our frail mortality, but came simply as a child into the midst of the ordinary charities of one human home.

Our God, Heaven cannot hold Him,
  Nor earth sustain;
Heaven and earth shall flee away,
  When He comes to reign!
In the bleak mid-winter
  A stable-place sufficed
The Lord God Almighty,
  Jesus Christ.

Enough for Him, whom cherubim
  Worship night and day,
A breastful of milk
  And a mangerful of hay.

Angels and archangels
  May have gathered there,
Cherubim and Seraphim
  Throng'd the air;
But only His mother,
  In her maiden bliss,
Worshipped the Beloved
  With a kiss.

The worshipping kiss of His mother reveals Him as no stranger come for a time to grace our human board, but a child in the home, not only as clad in all the weaknesses of our flesh, but to be fashioned by the loves and affections of home.

In His birth Jesus was as all the children of men, helpless like them, lapped in the same love and care, needing the same tendance. And, as He grew in wisdom and stature day by day, the same human relations formed Him, the same limitations were round about Him.

We learn from the Gospels that He shared our physical limitations. Like us, He was footsore and weary. At the well of Samaria, tired and jaded, He had to rest while His stronger disciples went on to the village to bring Him the nourishment He needed. There He asked for water from a passing woman. Weariness, fatigue, hunger, thirst He felt. All the wants of our bodily frame, commonplace as these are, He knew.

Our life too—that inward life of thought and feeling and affection—He knew in its littleness. Sin—that worst of all narrownesses and limitations, that which most prevents a full, deep experience of human life—was not in Him; but He felt all the outward bonds and fetters that cramp and confine the human soul. For thirty years He lived in Nazareth. There He worked as a carpenter. The works of His hands were not any marvellous works for the ages to wonder at and adore. No; men of genius, painters and sculptors and architects, have fashioned works of art, works of skill and beauty, pillared temple and carven marble and painted canvas, which have remained as priceless treasures to mankind. But such were not His works. They were simply the common articles of daily homely use among the villagers of Nazareth. That fact is striking enough, but yet what it implies is more striking. As men slowly, laboriously learn their handicrafts, as month after month, by industry and thought and care, they learn to use more deftly the tools of their craft, so Jesus in that workshop in Nazareth, through months and years, applied Himself to learn His craft. For years He bent His mind to that occupation; His work, and all the common incidents of that work, engrossed His thought and attention for the time. The daily cares, too, of a household not much lifted above poverty, narrow and hampering as these are, were His. And all the local interests of that little town, petty as such interests are; the small gossip; the talk of the neighbours; the social intercourse and amusements when the day's work was done,—these He lived among, taking kindly part and interest in all.

It is difficult for us to bind our minds down to the simple facts. Our fancy flies away on deceiving wing, and thinking of the wonder of His presence in Nazareth, we dream—

> Oh to have watched Thee thro' the vineyard wander,
> Pluck the ripe ears, and into evening roam,—
> Followed, and known that in the twilight yonder
> Legions of angels shone around Thy home.

But the villagers of Nazareth saw no angels over the house of Mary; they saw no halo round the head of the lad as He walked in the streets or as He prayed in the synagogue. They saw Him at work like other lads in His father's shop, and mingling in the common life of the town. That was the simple spirit of His life. We see it in His kindly watching of the children at their play in the market-place; we see it in the surprise of His townsfolk when He spoke in the synagogue.

But at length Jesus left that quiet, humble life. He came forth as the Teacher and Leader and Saviour of men. Did He then quite change His manner of living? Was the spirit of His public life in contrast to the spirit of these retired days? Did He then set Himself on high, far removed from men, to work gloriously in their sight? No; He did not even remove Himself so far from men as earth's great men do. He gathered round Himself a small circle of friends,—humble, unlettered men most of them were,—and the greatest part even of these eventful years was spent simply in their midst, thinking and talking about them, their character and thoughts.

The feelings of Jesus, too, His affections and emotions, were more intensely human; they were more rooted in the present, more fixed upon the personal friends near Him, than we would ever have looked for. The Roman Stoic would not weep when his wife and daughter were sold into slavery, because such was the will of God, and it only became him, a mortal, to bow in submission; St. Augustine would not weep when his mother died, for his assured faith saw her in glory,—but Jesus wept at the grave of Lazarus, at that which was no lasting death but a sleep, whose waking was very nigh. Socrates, before drinking the hemlock, had his weeping wife removed, because her clamorous grief disturbed the quiet of his intercourse with his friends on the hope of immortality,—but Jesus sought to comfort His weeping mother and His loved disciple from the Cross. And the consolation He gave was not the revelation of any hidden

truth, or the inspiration of some lofty utterance, but was simply the commending of the one to the loving care of the other. And, again, after the Resurrection, when the days of His humiliation were past, He showed that it was the same Jesus who had risen from the grave, He whose life in past days had moved among the simple charities of the universal human heart. For He did not declare Himself in any public or official way as we might have thought right and necessary. It was to the sad, hopeless hearts, whom on the Cross He saw weeping, as in agony His human strength faded away into the darkness of death, He came with everlasting cheer and hope.

So far from being lifted up above the small interests of life, so far from being forgetful of all the petty human detail of it, our blessed Lord appears to have been more bound up in them than our great men have been. Now these little things are the great material of our life. They fill most of our days; they occupy most of our thoughts and feelings. Were they not also the great material of the life of Christ Jesus, transfigured, glorified, made divine by the perfect spirit that was His, but yet the vast material, the greater portion of the details out of which that life formed itself?

How many men and women are troubled day after day by little fretting cares and worries, small wearing discomforts and annoyances? They seem so small and trifling that they would be ashamed to make much of them in the hearing of others; but yet petty as they are, they darken the sunshine of life, they wear away its pleasantness, they tend to make them fretful and irritable. How much more easily borne would they be, how their poison would be taken away, did they cherish the thought that He who is their Lord and God, whose eye is ever on them, and whose heart is ever full of love and sympathy for them, felt all these in His own life on earth; that that life was so really human that it was not wholly above these little things; and that in heaven His heart is so human still that, even in the midst of all the glory, He fully remembers them all, and can stoop—nay, would never think of it as stooping—to sympathise with His people in them too!

'Such ever is love's way; to rise, it stoops.' Christ Jesus in love stoops even to our commonest need; He stoops to make the most trivial facts of our days means of a communion of love between Him and us; and thus stooping, He passes to the shrine of all our life, to the homage of its every moment. Through this sympathy in life's commonplace, His love wins its way through all our heart and life. For, after all, is not the commonplace of life that which is important? If we hallow it, all is hallowed. Times of uplifting, times of great purposes felt along the blood and filling the heart with emotion, times of lofty worship and meditation, times of high thought and endeavour, are few. At their best and purest, they are the blossom and flower and fruit of the large life of petty interests and paltry duties and trivial thoughts. It is in that large commonplace life that the power of our religion lies, much more than in these lofty moments. It is there that we are storing up strength and insight and character for these highest best moments of our life. We need never fear then that any cares and fears, any hopes and joys, are too homely, too much of the earth earthy, for Him to care about. We may look up, in and through them all, to Him who has trodden that same lowly way before us, who told the deepest truths of His religion in figures of men's commonest work, who in the guest-chamber forgave an erring woman all her sin, and who made man's commonest meal to be the holiest rite of His religion; and His sympathy will wondrously lighten all its weariness, and fill with the light and the life of heaven its every duty however small, its every interest however paltry.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Rothe's Speculative System.[1]

Rothe's hundredth birthday (he was born 28th January 1799) was celebrated with much ceremony in Heidelberg on 9th February. An address was delivered in the *aula* of the university by Professor Tröltsch, Dean of the Theological Faculty; and thereafter a bust of Rothe was unveiled in the Peterskirche by *Kirchenrat* Dr. Lemme. All theological parties united in paying honour to one whom they now regard as the brightest ornament of the romantic university town on the banks of the Neckar.

In connexion with this centenary a good deal of literature has already been published;[2] but the most important of all these publications is doubtless Holtzmann's *Exposition and Criticism of Rothe's Speculative System.* Before giving an account of it, however, we would refer to the *Bilder*, etc., noted at the end of the footnote below. Besides a short sketch by Holtzmann, this booklet contains Rothe's famous sermon on 'The Conflict between Faith and Unbelief in Jesus in the Hearts of the Children of our Time'; and also his 'Theses regarding the Present Ecclesiastical Situation.' One of these is as follows: 'As regards doctrine, the Church must proclaim Christ to the *present*, living generation, and therefore in its own tongue, *i.e.* it must proclaim Christ, not in a dogmatic form that belongs to a long past age, and that has now become almost purely historical, but by means of the present generation's own sentiments, thoughts, and forms of expression. That which our contemporaries most of all need is the presentation of the great and unique *historical facts*, by which there is a Divine revelation in the world. To be assured of the reality of these facts, and to be able to understand them as accurately and completely as is possible with the means at our disposal, this is what our contemporaries need. The Church must do its utmost to satisfy this need. It can do so, however, only if, on the one hand, trusting in its sacred cause it fearlessly allows perfect freedom of inquiry, and if, on the other hand, it takes care that the results of its theological labour are not kept back from the non-theological community, but become as far as possible a common possession.'

Rothe is certainly one of the most interesting of the religious thinkers of the century. But he is also one of the most difficult. Almost everyone that has mastered German has been attracted, at one time or another, to the study of his undoubtedly great work on *Theological Ethics*; but probably very few have persevered to the end. The world in which the author lives is so very remote from that in which we live, his theory of knowlege is so totally different from ours, his thought is frequently so utterly unintelligible to us, that we sometimes wonder if it is thought and not merely words skilfully strung together; and at last the reader, unless he is very specially constituted, lays the great work aside, half ashamed of himself for being unfit for the society of such an interesting personality. He reads with delight and profit the Sermons, the *Stille Stunden*, the Exposition of First John; if he is wise, he also frequently dips into the latter volumes of the *Ethik*; ever and anon he is tempted to renew his acquaintance with the first volumes (if indeed he can really be said to have an acquaintance with them); but the result is once more disappointing and humiliating. And yet one is convinced that in these volumes there are rich treasures, if only one could be put in the way of discovering them. To all lovers of Rothe, who are in this mood, Professor Holtzmann's *Exposition and Criticism* will be most acceptable.

Professor Holtzmann is well qualified for the task that he has undertaken. As a colleague of Rothe, he was intimately acquainted with him personally; and nearly thirty years ago, after Rothe's death, he edited vols. iv. and v. of the second edition of the *Theologische Ethik*. Although he refers occasionally to the *Stille Stunden*, the

[1] *R. Rothe's Speculative System: dargestellt und beurtheilt.* Von H. J. Holtzmann. Freiburg i. B., Leipzig, und Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1899. 8vo, pp. ix, 269. Price M.5.60.

[2] Bassermann, *Richard Rothe als praktischer Theologe*, M.1.60; W. Hönig, *Richard Rothe: sein Charakter, Leben, und Denken*, M.2.0; Paul Metzger, *Richard Rothe: ein theologisches Charakterbild*, M.1.20; Tröltsch, 'Richard Rothe,' in the *Christliche Welt* for 26th January; also *Richard Rothe: Bilder aus der evangelisch-protestantischen Landeskirche Badens* v., M.0.80.

Zur Dogmatik, etc., his exposition is based mainly upon the *Ethik*. He proceeds in a very methodical manner, discussing first of all Rothe's 'speculative principle'; secondly, his 'general view of the world'; and then, in five sections, what we might call his ethics. One of those five sections treats of 'sin and redemption' (the nature of sin, the origin of sin, the relation of God to sin, natural corruption, redemption and miracle, the Redeemer and His kingdom, etc.); and the last section of all deals with 'the Church, the State, and the consummation of all things.' On all these points the exposition is full and clear. Holtzmann, however, does not limit himself to the exposition of Rothe's thought. In a most gracious yet searching manner he also criticizes him. He shows how the system was rooted in Rothe's own personality and in his moral and religious experience; how it was related to the speculations of the time in which he lived, and how far we, in the present generation, have moved away from the presuppositions on which it was based. While also exhibiting the confusions of thought of which Rothe was guilty, and the contradictions with his own system into which he frequently fell, he brings out clearly the intellectual greatness and the genuine Christianity of his 'ever-memorable teacher and colleague'; and emphasizes what is permanently valuable in his speculation, notwithstanding the fact that much in it is already antiquated. There is so much of what is supremely valuable in Rothe that we cannot but be exceedingly thankful to Professor Holtzmann for having made him more accessible to us. Whether regarded as an exposition or a criticism, his treatise is altogether admirable.

Glasgow. DAVID EATON.

Paul the Missionary.[1]

THIS clever and graphic sketch of Paul the missionary belongs to the *Sammlung* of popular lectures and essays in Theology and the History of Religion, in course of publication by the house of Mohr in Freiburg. The author sets out with the complaint, more true of Germany than England, that Paul is conceived by moderns as 'the learned thinker rather than the man of action.' This misapprehension he thoroughly corrects,—perhaps even to excess. His picture has not altogether escaped free from the faults natural to this kind of work, which requires strong colours and broad effects. Pages 5–10 describe *the conditions, favourable and unfavourable*, of Paul's missionary life; 10–18, *the personality of the missionary*; 18–21, *the course of his mission*; 21–36, *its principles and manner of proceeding*. The last section is the most fresh and telling part of the lecture. In his Doctrine of the Future Life (*Das Jenseits*) Wernle finds the strongest weapon of Paul's evangelism; and in his use of the Sacraments, a chief means of securing and consolidating his conquests. He inclines to think the latter something of a dangerous concession to Hellenism with its love of 'the mysteries,' and a sacrifice of the pure spirituality of Paul's own faith. He makes far too little of the gospel of forgiveness, and of the charm of holiness, as factors in the apostle's success; and this is a cardinal defect. He throws into strong relief the sociality of Paul's Churches. The following passage deserves consideration by all modern ecclesiastics: 'We who to-day preserve in our Sunday worship and in the festival of the Lord's Supper the last slender remnant of the common life of the early Church, have no idea of the intensity and intimacy of attachment, the wonderful sense of fellowship, which then united men as brothers, lifting them clean above all distinctions of nation, rank, and sex. The superiority of the Christian brotherhood to all other unions in helping and loving, played as large a part in securing its ascendency as did the certainty of its hopes of the beyond.'

G. G. FINDLAY.

Headingley College, Leeds.

[1] *Paulus als Heidenmissionar.* Ein Vortrag. Von Lic. P. Wernle. Freiburg i. B.: Verlag von Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate, 1899. M.0.80.

Some Exegetical Studies.

By the Rev. James Wells, D.D., Glasgow.

The editor wishes a few papers in which Exegetical Studies are interwoven with literary or historical illustrations. I begin with a foreword.

Every preacher should be a genuine lover of New Testament Greek. If so, verily he shall not miss his reward. From the first, he will have a keen intellectual enjoyment; for the Greek tongue is the most beautiful and perfect instrument of thought yet invented by man. Some Greek words and phrases will yield him such a delight as the friend of Nature has when he examines a clean shell, a fresh flower, or a ripe berry. Nor will he need to go far afield for helpful illustrations; for all the New Testament writers imitate their Master in His love of Symbols. Suggestive metaphors lurk under very many of the great words of Scripture, though they are often concealed by our version. Moreover, the preacher has special comfort and hope in employing the very images of Holy Scriptures. This style of Bible study brings with it unfailing freshness and attraction. Witness the success of the late Dr. Andrew Bonar, even down to the close of his long life. And it is likely to arrest the attention of the careless. Brownlow North used to say that men were often brought into the Kingdom when surprised by a flash of new light from a familiar text. The patient exegete will agree with Thomas Boston, whose frequent exclamation was, 'Adoro plenitudinem Scripturæ.' He has often the joys, and sometimes also the honours, of discovery: he has his 'surprises,' his 'finds,' his 'beauties,' his gems and jewels of exposition: now and again he may 'strike oil,' or come upon a vein of pure gold. He should not think that everything has been said and that he has come too late. He should have the spirit of that South African millionaire who died lately. When he arrived at the Cape, a diamond miner advised him to go back at once, as the country had been swept clean of diamonds. The new adventurer pushed on, and soon made his fortune. Æschylus said that his plays were just morsels from the Homeric Banquet: the best expositors offer us only morsels from the Banquet of Holy Writ.

We have three happy and pregnant names for the scholarly study of the Bible: Exegesis, Exposition, and Hermeneutics. Words of the same family as Exegesis and Hermeneutics are found in the Greek New Testament. Exegesis (ἐξ, ἡγέομαι), in its secondary or metaphorical sense, means the drawing or leading or bringing out. It suggests a great stock or store on which one can draw, a treasure out of which one may bring forth things new and old. It also reminds us that all one has to do is to draw: one needs not to create, or piece out, or blend, or modify. The best scripturalist, says Luther, is the best divine. Jacob at the well of Haran was a true exegete: he rolled away the great stone from the well's mouth and drew out the sweet, cool water for the thirsty sheep. If half-memories don't mislead, Bengel, prince of exegetes, likens himself to Jacob at the well — a very happy illustration. Joseph also was a good exegete when he brought the garnered grain from the royal storehouses and fed the famished Egyptians. And so was Melchizedek when he brought forth bread and wine for the war-worn Abraham and his men. And so were the disciples when they carried forth the miraculous bread which grew by being given away. The dictionaries tell us that to 'exegese' means in classical Greek to interpret dreams, oracles, or omens. Daniel was thus exegete and divine to Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. The ancients counted him the best divine who best divined.

The word *Exposition* illumines our subject. The French use it for a great public exhibition. The exhibitor exerts all his ingenuity to set forth his exhibit to the greatest possible advantage, and advertise it as widely as possible. Through gates of beauty he conducts the admiring spectator to the halls which contain the masterpieces of modern art. Melanchthon described Justus Jonas, his typical preacher, as a man who could vividly explain and clearly express the words of the text, and set them out for the market. A shopkeeper said lately that he had doubled his sales by exchanging gas light for electricity. He who can surround the truth with a brilliant light is a genius; for he makes the familiar new, and the common marvellous,

as if it were a fresh revelation. The setting out of our ideas for the market requires us to place them in a clear light. This is a great part of the problem with every exhibitor of truth. *Virtutem videant. Voir, c'est avoir.* Many a gospel-hearer is like the chained man in Plato's Bunyan—in the allegory of the cave. His back is to the cave's mouth, and his light is from a fire behind him, which throws upon the floor in front of him the quivering shadows which he mistakes for substances. The cave has an echo, which is the only sound the bond-slave hears. The preacher wishes to have these chains knocked off, so that he may guide his pupil from cave-light to starlight, from starlight to moonlight, and from moonlight to sunlight at noon, so that, no longer the dupe of appearances or opinion, he may walk at liberty amid sunlit realities, far from the pale realm of illusions and shows.

Plato says that his cave-dweller, upon beholding the sun, would fall down and praise God for having made so glorious an object. He expects him to be mastered at once by its self-evidencing light. All this appeals directly to the preacher who strives to exhibit Christ as the Light and Life of men. Plato also tells us that the truth-seeker, emerging from his dim cave, would be dazzled and bewildered. His weak eyes at first would be able to look upon only the shadows in the water; but by and by they would gather strength, and become strong enough, eagle-like, to welcome all the direct splendours of noon. Here the allegory fails. The Word has been made flesh, and thus the divine light has been softened and attempered to our weak vision. Moreover, the Spirit who reveals the object, at the same time ennobles the organ. Light and eyesight are His twin gifts.

As *Exegesis* suggests the matter, and *Exposition* the manner, so *Hermeneutics* suggests the aim of preaching. It used to be a favourite word, but it has now grown old-fashioned. It is worth our while to get back to its root. It is derived from the Greek Hermes, who was often identified with the Roman Mercury. He was the swift-winged messenger or herald of Jupiter. He was very friendly to men, and he bore a sacred branch as the emblem of peace. The word hermeneutics thus reminds us that the preacher is to play the part of a sacred Hermes. He is clothed upon with an authority greater than his own, and sent on an errand of divine mercy. He has to do with God's truth as a definite message to individuals. He is concerned with persons as well as with propositions. He is an ambassador who beseeches men to be reconciled to God. Tholuck, as his biographer informs us, in poor health, for fifty years did his work joyfully, like Mercury, the celestial messenger, with wings to his feet.

The Still Undeciphered Hittite Inscriptions.

IN REPLY TO PROFESSOR JENSEN.

By Professor Fritz Hommel, Ph.D., LL.D., Munich.

For years I have followed most carefully the attempts of Professor Jensen to decipher the Hittite inscriptions, and have gone into the details of these more thoroughly perhaps than any other Orientalist, even Professor Reckendorf included. And from the very first it was clear to me that even *if* Professor Jensen was right with his Syennesis key, yet the Indo-Germanic Armenian hypothesis was out of the question. But even before the appearance of Leopold Messerschmidt's 'Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Inschriften' (in the *Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, Berlin, 3 Jahrg., 1898, No. 5),—a pamphlet which, strangely enough, is not mentioned by Professor Jensen,—it was for me an established fact that even the Cilician personal name Syennesis (which as a mere title is nowhere demonstrable) cannot be the key. At least Professor Jensen's reading of the group, which he rightly recognizes as a title, x-y-z-x (and nominative ending), as S-'-n-s- (*i.e. Syennesis*), is merely a still undemonstrable *possibility* so long as there are other possibilities whose conceivability Professor Jensen in his certainty of victory has plainly not taken

into account. I go still further, however, and maintain that *Syennesis* is an absolutely impossible reading in the case before us, for in the first place, and above all, it is no title, but an Asia Minor personal name derived from *Zua*, and in the next place, in all probability the -ες- (Syenn*es*) which stands before the Greek termination -ις is itself merely the Asia Minor nominative ending (as this appears perhaps in ἀρβασις, originally *arva-s*). Hence this name had properly sounded only *Syenne-s* (*Zuarna*?), while in the above group the second x is not an ending, but belongs to the root; or if one does not accept this, the cuneiform *Zualzas*[1] would be identical with *Syennesis*.

It appears to me that the first question one has to ask is this: Was there not in Asia Minor any royal *title* (not royal *name*) that satisfies the above conditions (first of its letters the same as the fourth)? Even if there was, still, in view of the slender materials at our disposal, and the complicated character of the writing, we should be face to face with a mere possibility whose exact demonstration could be furnished only by a larger number of inscriptions, or, better still, by a fuller bilingual. Till then, to speak of an actual decipherment is presumption springing from an overrating of the human faculty of knowledge.

Now, we know various Asia Minor terms which served for 'king' or 'ruler,' of which, however, no one at first appears to suit our x-y-z-x. These are such as the Lydian κοαλδδειν (perhaps accusative of κοαλδδι, *gvaldi*), the Lycian *khbida* (*gvid* for *gvild*?), the Carian γελαν, the Phrygian βαλην, the Alarodian *yanzu* (cf. the Scythian Ἰανδυσος?), and finally the Lydian πάλμυς. If one notes that the Lydian royal name *Alyattes* (in which -αττης is the well-known divine name עתי, *'Ate*, cuneiform *Khattu-* in *Khattu-shar*, Egyp. *Kheta-sar*) is properly ϜαλϜειατης, *Valveiates*, and that elsewhere too in Asia Minor personal names we meet with the element βαλβι (*e.g.* in Βαλβιώας, cf. Ὀβρα-μόας, or in Βανβα, *i.e. Vanva*), it may not be too bold to assume a title *valvi* answering to what has come down to us only in the Grecised form πάλμυς, and even tentatively to represent our x-y-z-x by this in the form *vi-a-l-vi* or (with the nominative ending *s*, recognized by Professor Sayce) *vi-a-l-vi-s*.

[1] Likewise P.-N., cf. Bît-Zualzas (of Tiglath-Pileser III.) in Media, and other local names beginning with Bît; *e.g.* the well-known Bît-Khumri = Samaria.

It is not my intention here to pursue further the consequences which flow from this, in the first instance, yet hypothetical identification. I would only remark, that, if Professor Jensen has correctly determined the values *r* and *m* (cf. for *m* the Cypriote sign *mo* which had been noted even before Jensen), in that case the word which he interprets 'great' should be read not *m-s* but *m-vi* (cf. -μοας of the Asia Minor proper names), 'I am' should be not *s-mi* but *vi-mi* (cf. the Vannic *-ubi*, the ending of the 1st pers. sing.), and 'king' should be not *s-r* (*sira*) but *vi-r* (*vir*, *ivr*, cf. Vannic *euri*, 'lord,' Mitannic *ibri*). On the other hand, I would suggest that in the inscription of Bor the name which Professor Jensen reads *Tar-s* (Tarsus) should rather be *Ka-vi* or *K-vi*, *i.e.* the land of Kuï in Cilicia, well-known from the cuneiform inscriptions, for I take the first sign in this word to be a variant of the second sign in *Kark-k-mi*, which latter name Professor Jensen has probably deduced correctly.

As to this name (*Karchemis*), I may at the same time add a remark which is not without importance for the future deciphering of the Hittite inscriptions. This name (assuming that it is correctly read), be it observed, has no determinative, although, according to Jensen, there is a frequently recurring determinative for 'land' and another almost identical with it, which he takes to mean 'god.' That the two are simply variants of one and the same sign is plain; and even before Professor Jensen this was generally recognized. It is the hieroglyph representing a circle with a perpendicular stroke, ⊕, frequently with two perpendicular strokes (whereas the sign which Professor Jensen reads *m*, and which must not be confused with this, is ⓘ). According to Professor Sayce, this sign was used everywhere as the determinative for 'god'; according to Thomas Tyler (1892), everywhere for 'city,' even in the notes to the inscriptions of Boghazkiöi (there = 'city gods'). That Sayce was right in this is now clearly proved by a seal cylinder published by Mr. Ward, in which the supreme god of the Hittites is portrayed and mentioned along with another divinity, probably his wife (see below). The legend on this seal would read, according to Jensen: Land of Kilik (Cilicia) -rk (or -lk as phonetic complement); Land of Arzip; *ar-s* (= *arats*, 'guardian,' 'shepherd'); ideogram for 'brave' (a knife); and ∩ (= *dsario*, 'king'). The whole would amount to something like this: 'Of

the lands of Cilicia and Arzip, the guardian, the brave king.' That this cannot be correct is clear. In accordance with general analogy, one expects either the proper name of the owner of the cylinder, or it may chance the name of the god portrayed upon it. Now, since the determinative with which the first and the second items of the legend commence will have meant either 'god' or 'city,' it is plain that here it can be only the determinative for 'god,' and that thus, as a matter of course, wherever Professor Jensen has read 'the land of Cilicia,' we ought rather to substitute the name of this supreme god. It can surely be no accident that the hieroglyph for this god represents a serpent, , and that on the above-named seal cylinder the image of the divinity is 'a serpent or dragon raised on a pole.' I would suggest the pronunciation *Tark*, and do not consider it impossible even that δράκων is a primitive Asia Minor loan-word from the name of this very Hittite serpent-god. Upon the cylinder this serpent has a goat's head, which gives the best explanation of why it is that on the 'silver boss' an antelope's head corresponds to the name-element *Tarku*; the legend, in spite of Professor Jensen's impossible reading *Silkuashemi*, is clear and distinct—*Tarku-u-dim* (written *MU*, but having also the phonetic value *dim*) *-me sharru mât alu Me-tan.*

In close connexion with this dragon-god there is found, alike on Mr. Ward's cylinder, in the inscription of Bulgarmaden, the bowl of Babylon, and (standing alone) in the inscriptions of Jerâbis (Karchemish), another divinity (ideogram: rhomb and bird), which I take accordingly to be the wife of Tarkhu, because in the inscriptions of Jerâbis the sign is followed by the appellative *kark-mi-o* + 'queen' (Jerâbis, i. lines 2, 4, 5). In this way, too, we can best explain why, whenever she is named at all, she comes almost always directly after the dragon-god. The bird sacred to her is probably rather the dove than an eagle.

Along with the possibility of reading x-y-z-x (+ nominative ending *s*) otherwise than as *Syennesis* (cf. above the much more probable *vi-a-l-vi-s*), and the certainty that the serpent ideogram designates not a land (Cilicia) but the supreme god of the Hittites (probably *Tarkhu*), the greatest part of Professor Jensen's book, *Hittiter und Armenier*, of course crumbles to pieces. When in that book he says (p. xxii) that his opponents have to show why the ordinary rules of logic do not apply to the Hittites, I would remark, by way of making the position plain, that from a false starting-point further conclusions of a most ingenious and captivating character may be drawn in accordance with the strict rules of logic, and yet the main result must be false just because the premises were wholly or partially false. It is also much to be regretted that Professor Jensen always treats opposition to his views as a personal injury, and that he seeks to depreciate as much as possible any correct results that have been reached by others before him. If Professor Sayce, for instance, has recognized, through the intuitive perception of genius, any truth for which it demands no great skill to adduce further more exact proofs, we are told that he simply 'had a presentiment' of it, or, like the blind hen, hit upon the right thing 'by accident,' whereas Professor Jensen himself has 'proved' it. This is a disagreeable trait which disturbs one's enjoyment even of the many truly creative strokes of this writer, amongst which, *e.g.*, I unreservedly count the discovery of x-y-z-x as a title in which the first letter and the fourth must have the same value. It is thus characteristically only the 'victory of a cause' about which Professor Jensen is primarily concerned, and any one who ventures to hold a different opinion is assigned to the category of arrogant or envious 'opponents'; whereas to every scholar the main thing ought to be the victory of the truth, whether Sayce or Jensen or Hommel or others have a larger or a smaller share in it.

But now let us return to the alleged Armenianism of the language of the Hittite inscriptions. Even if it were granted that *Syennesis* is the true key, how much does Professor Jensen thereby learn of the character of this language, whose inscriptions, according to him, contain only titles? *Es*, we are told, means 'I,' and *mi*, 'I am,' and in Armenian *es* (from *eso*) is 'I,' and *em* (from *esmi*), 'I am.' But even in pre-Indo-Germanic Armenian, the so-called Vannic, which lies much nearer and yet is left entirely out of view by Professor Jensen, 'I' is *ies*, and there too the form 'I am' appears to have contained a labial (cf. 1st sing. *-ubi*), just as, for instance, also in Sumerian 'to be' was expressed by *mi*. Further, according to Professor Jensen, the genitive plural ended in *-m* (which is disputed by others, such as Reckendorf and Messerschmidt), and it so happens precisely that in Armenian the ancient Indo-Germanic gen. plur. end-

ing is no longer discoverable. Again, in the Hittite inscriptions there is a nominative sing. ending in *-s* still in vigorous use, although perhaps in certain cases (for reasons as yet unknown to us) it has been dropped, and just here once more Armenian wants all trace of an original nominative in *-s*. Professor Jensen tells us that *mes* means 'great' (Armenian *mets*), but, assuming that his reading is correct, we might have here equally well an Iranian (Scythian) *maz*, for the presence of Iranians in these regions at least subsequent to *c.* 1400 B.C. has been shown (cf. Hommel, *Hethiter und Skythen*, Prag, 1898). According to Professor Jensen, the ancient name of the Armenians, *Hay*, originated from *Hatio*. But, according to P. de Lagarde, in Armenian *ati* became *ay* only immediately before a consonant, *e.g.* *hair* = 'father,' from *pater*. Moreover, the name of the country *Hani* may be the prototype of *Hay*, not to speak of the possibility that *Hay* = *Hatio* might simply have been taken over from the aboriginal Vannic inhabitants, like so much else in the speech of the Armenians who migrated in the sixth century from Phrygia (or, earliest of all, from Thracia), *i.e.* the speech of the ancient Alarodians, who were gradually Indo-Germanized by the Armenians. But perhaps Professor August Fick is right in deriving *Hay* from *Pai* in Paionia (cf. Kata-onia, Lyka-onia).

Strangest of all, however, are the further proofs offered by Professor Jensen of the Armenianism of the Hittite inscriptions, namely, the acrophonic derivation of a number of phonetic values from Armenian words. The figure of the pointed shoe he reads (rightly or wrongly) *t*, and compares the rare Armenian word *trekh* (a kind of peasant's shoe), although the Lesgian *tapi*, *dabri*, *tipir* = 'shoe,' lay equally near to his hand, provided this method of procedure is to be approved at all. A semicircle in this position ⊂ he holds (perhaps rightly) to be *r*; but in this Professor Jensen by a great stretch of imagination sees the figure of the 'worm,' although this would certainly have been depicted as coiled, and compares the Armenian *ordn*, 'worm.' The figure of a long beak denotes, we are told, *ar*, and with this the Armenian *aragil* (from *varagil*, cf. πελαργός, Russian *zherabl* = 'crane,' hence orig. *gharagil*), 'stork,' is compared. The bird in the above described divine ideogram, which, however, Jensen reads *Arzavi*, is held to be an eagle, on account of the Armenian *artsiv* = 'eagle.' This last, however, is an ancient Iranian loan-word in Armenian (Zend, *erezivya*), and, if Jensen's reading were correct, might witness equally well in favour of a Scythian origin for the Hittites. The sign for *a* is preceded by the figure of a jar; now it is no wonder, in view of the manifold names for 'jar,' 'vase,' or 'pitcher,' to find one beginning with *a*; Jensen finds two names for one of these vessels, namely, *aman* and *anoth*. Unfortunately, however, both are loan-words, the first Iranian (cf. Persian *mân*, and hence also the Syrian *mân*), and the second Semitic. A calf's head is held to indicate the sound of P, which, however, is extremely questionable; now, we are reminded, 'calf' in Armenian is *orth* (New Armenian *horth*), which perhaps arose from an older *porth* (cf. πόρτις), whereas *ordn*, 'worm,' for instance, is offered as proof for *r*. But who can guarantee us that both *orth* and *ordn* were not in the most ancient Armenian pronounced *vorth* (or *forth*) and *vordn* (*fordn*)? The ram's head has perhaps the phonetic value *k* or *g*, hence Jensen compares the Armenian *khoy* = 'ram,' whereas, *e.g.* the Lesgian *ke*, *kha*, *kheb* = 'sheep,' might as well (only from a different standpoint) have been compared; nay, it may be that even the Armenian *khoy* comes from the Caucasian languages, and was thus of Alarodian origin. But the largest demand is made upon us in connexion with the words *hat* = 'cut' (infin. *hatanel*), *trtsak* = 'bundle,' and *mtruk* = 'foal.' A hand with a gimlet or a style (not a knife) is said to have the phonetic value *khat*, with which *hatanel* = 'cut' (properly κόπτειν) is compared; a real knife, on the other hand, indicates a word-separater (as the cutting agent)! Again, a tied up wine-skin (cf. a quite similar looking Egyptian hieroglyph) is intended to represent *tar*, of which *trtsak*, 'bundle (of clothes?)' is supposed to furnish the explanation. Finally, a sign which might as well represent a vase tapering to a point at the bottom as a foal's head, is held, on the ground of the Armenian *mtruk* = 'foal,' to be an ideogram for the royal name *Mutallu*, a name which was spread over the whole of Asia Minor and reached even as far as Etruria, as is proved by the Lycian *Motala*, *Motlis*, the Cilician *Motales*, the Hittite *Mutanlu* (not *Motanar*), the Carian *Motylos*, the Latin (originally Etruscan) *Metellus*. From the names *Obri-motes*, *Arsa-motes*, *Ma-motasis*, *Mota-surgis* one sees that we have here an Alarodian root *mot* enlarged by *l* and employed as a proper

name, which of course can have no connexion with the Armenian *mtṙuk*, unless the latter word is derived from the pre-Indo-Germanic Armenian. Such a method of argument may impose upon whom it will, it does not support the Armenianism of the Hittite inscriptions, but discredits it in the highest degree.

More attractive appear such contentions as that for an Armenian *te* = 'lord' (from an older *deo*, 'god'), deduced from *ter*, 'lord' (*te* + *ari* 'man'), and *tekin*, 'mistress' (*te* + *kin*, 'woman'). But even here we may have to do with simply an old Scythian loan-word or an Alarodian and not a genuine Armenian term (genuine Armenian in the sense of Phrygio-Armenian), for the same *te*, 'lord,' appears as early as the second millennium B.C. in the divine names *Teshub* (cf. *Tishpak* and *Shipak*) and *Tekhip* (cf. *Khipa*). Here we may remark that the ethnological inferences drawn by Jensen (*Hittiter und Armenier*, p. 202 f., and earlier in the *ZDMG*, 48, 434 ff.) from the different position of the divine name in proper names are fundamentally wrong. He there distinguishes, apart from his *Hatio* Armenians, two non-Indo-Germanic populations of W. Asia, one Aegeo-Armenian (or Lycian), in whose proper names the divine name always stands first (*e.g.* Tarkhu-nazi, Tarkhu-lara), and another Aegeo-Zagrian (Mitanni, Vannic, and Elamite), in whose proper names the divine name appears only in the second place (*e.g.* Kili-Teshup). That this division is radically wrong I have already shown in my Assyriological Notes, § 24 and 25 (*Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc.* xix. pp. 79 ff.), consequently the whole treatment of the subject in Jensen's book (pp. 202–206) belongs to the region of airy speculation. The circumstance that a certain Sadi-Teshup (cf. the Lydian *Sady-attes* = Sadi-Khati), is the son of Khattu-sir (*i.e.* Khati-sir, Kheta-sir = 'the god Khati, is exalted' or the like), and other similar cases, shatter all these hyper-ingenious combinations. With reference to the god Khati compare, by the way, also the name of the well-known goddess 'Atar-'ati, Atar-gatis, Derketo, in which Jensen (p. 157 f.) strangely believes that the divine name *Tarkhu* (with Semitic feminine ending) is concealed, being unaware of the Armenian form for this, *Thar-hatay*, *Thara-hat* (P. de Lagarde, *Mitth.* i. 78), which would at the same time have shown him that a Hittite word *Khati* becomes in Armenian *Hatay*, not *Hay*.

I might go on for pages enumerating further absurdities, but what has been adduced will suffice, I hope, to leave the impression that there is nothing in the Armenian hypothesis, and that in spite of the assenting voices of some friends of Professor Jensen, Professor Sayce is perfectly justified in speaking of the Hittite inscriptions as —still undeciphered.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

Messrs. Blackwood & Sons have published a new edition of Professor Campbell Fraser's Gifford Lectures on the *Philosophy of Theism*. The two volumes of the original issue have been reduced to one. The result is an immense gain in terseness and clearness. Now the argument which runs through the lectures is followed without distraction, and its weight is increased by the introduction into the volume, here and there, of new paragraphs, and especially by the lucid retrospect at the close.

From the office of *The Christian Pictorial* comes the twelfth handsome volume, which contains the weekly numbers from September 1898 to February 1899. We rejoice greatly in the prosperity of this paper. Its tone is always good, its contents are always stimulating. It avoids the hard and narrow on the one side and the worldly godless on the other. The continued stories are its only weakness.

ANECDOTES AND MORALS. By the Rev. Louis Albert Banks, D.D. (*Funk & Wagnalls*. Crown 8vo, pp. xlvi, 417. 6s.)

Dr. Banks has gathered his anecdotes from the newspapers, and has gathered well. He gives them in the briefest form, and he never fails to

add the moral. Perhaps some prefer to get the moral made for them in this way, but we should have taken the anecdote alone more gladly. Here is an average example: '*A Wild Ride.*—The death of one of the early settlers of Texas recalled the story of the capture, by a band of Indians, of a young man and his wife on their wedding day. In order to torture them, they were tied on the back of a wild buffalo, and then the desperate and maddened animal was turned loose, and with fiendish jeers the Indians bade them go on their wedding journey. The buffalo was captured finally by their friends, and they escaped death, and had a long life together. One might better be tied to the back of a wild beast than be bound helpless by the chains of habit to some cruel appetite that mercilessly drags the soul down to the gates of death.'

BANNERS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By the Right Rev. A. F. Winnington Ingram, D.D. (*Wells Gardner.* Fcap. 8vo, pp. 211. 3s. 6d.)

These simple discourses, as their author calls them, were well worth publishing, though he seems honestly to doubt that. For they handle the great Divine and human verities,—Faith, Hope, Love, Penitence, Prayer, and the like,—and they never miss some comforting, strengthening word upon them. To call us to the love and practice of love is better than to devise a new theory of the Atonement.

Messrs. Gibbings are still intent on the good work of issuing Dora Greenwell's books in a new and taking edition. The latest volume is the *Colloquia Crucis* (2s. 6d.). It is printed and bound appropriately, and it contains a portrait. The portrait makes this volume notable, and will cause it to be specially sought after. How wholesome is the combination of spiritual aspiration and common sense in Dora Greenwell's writings.

THE CALLS OF GOD. By the Rev. Ebenezer Morgan. (*Kelly.* Crown 8vo, pp. 348. 3s. 6d.)

'One great part of the history of the Bible is the history of Calls.' So said Dean Church. Mr. Morgan quotes the saying, and then writes this volume to prove it. The Calls given to thirteen men, from Adam to Paul, are described and illustrated. The illustration is a strong point. Mr. Morgan reads modern biography and finds many parallels there. So these sermons are good plain reading, with occasional felicities of illustration and application.

THE SPIRIT OF WATCHFULNESS. By T. T. Carter, M.A. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. 286. 5s.)

Canon Carter's aim in all these sermons is to draw us to a closer walk with God. And he never forgets that the closer walk with God must always be for us through Jesus Christ. But it is puzzling and sometimes almost painful that his way to the Father is through the physical Christ, the Christ as He was on earth, a bodily presence now to be apprehended in the sacrifice of the altar. Might it not be said that if that is still our only access, or even our chief access, it was not expedient for Christ to go away? And where is the Holy Spirit, and what is He doing? We thought this was His dispensation, and that His work was to commend the historical sacrifice of Christ as a past fact to us, and then to form the living Spiritual Christ in us. The book leads to a closer walk with God, but surely closer still and nobler would that walk be that is by faith and not by sight.

THE GOSPEL OF THE ATONEMENT. By the Ven. James M. Wilson, M.A. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. 165. 3s. 6d.)

In his Hulsean Lectures, now published, Archdeacon Wilson seeks to make the doctrine of the Atonement intelligible and acceptable to thinking people who know something of evolution and nothing of theology. As he does this, he lets go some things one may be the poorer for want of, but he certainly succeeds in showing that the Atonement is valid for the life of to-day, and that—whether there is peril in rejecting it or not—there is gain in accepting it. It may be doubted if to show this Mr. Wilson need have accepted the latest of the scientific theories so unreservedly, or broken so absolutely with his own theological past. But he is right that the Atonement is the centre of Christian doctrine still, and if we can be persuaded of that, much else will gather round it.

ASPECTS OF RELIGIOUS AND SCIENTIFIC THOUGHT. By the late Richard Holt Hutton. (*Macmillan.* Globe 8vo, pp. 415. 5s.)

To the 'Eversley' Series Messrs. Macmillan have now made this welcome addition. The volume contains no fewer than fifty-four of Mr. Hutton's choicest *Spectator* articles. One has been tempted

to bind the *Spectator* itself for their sake. How much handier and lovlier is this book. It is true, as has been said, that much of Mr. Hutton's prophesying has proved mistaken. But that does not deny the liberty of prophesying. And the permanent value of these essays is in their unfailing thoughtfulness and their provocation to fuller further thought.

To the well-known series of small volumes which he calls 'The Modern Reader's Bible,' Professor Moulton has added a children's anthology of *Bible Stories* (Macmillan, 2s. 6d.). Its text is the Revised Version, and the passages are chosen with great care, so that they may be read by children of every age and capacity. There are also notes and introductions. This volume deals with the Old Testament. We shall welcome the New Testament volume when it comes.

The second volume of the 'Eversley' *Shakespeare* is a thick globe 8vo of 571 pages, and contains five plays—'Taming of the Shrew,' 'Merchant of Venice,' 'Merry Wives of Windsor,' 'Twelfth Night,' and 'As You Like It.' The introductions are skilful selections of the essential by a practised Shakespeare scholar; the notes are, as before, only the absolutely essential.

Messrs. Macmillan have also issued a cheaper edition of the Earl of Selborne's *Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment* (pp. 381, 2s. 6d.).

Messrs. Macniven & Wallace have published a third edition of *Presbyterian Forms of Service*, an excellent volume of direction and suggestion for the conduct of public worship in Presbyterian Churches, issued by the Devotional Service Association of the United Presbyterian Church. The new edition is revised and enlarged.

THOUGHTS ON THE WORD. By H. Epworth Thompson. (*Marshall Brothers.* Crown 8vo, pp. 165.)

These thoughts are some original, some selected. They are all simple and short, intended for Christian workers, and intended for immediate use. But the feature of the little book is its careful choice of texts to illustrate the topics dealt with.

How little do we know of the weight that the moments carry as they pass us. On a certain hour of the night of the 3rd of June 1885, there came to a high-caste Hindu the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. It was an eternal birth to him. It has been an eternal birth to others. And now the story of the struggle, and all the grace that came after, is told in a small book, which Messrs. Marshall Brothers have published under the title of *From Siva to Christ.*

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have also published two volumes of sermons by the Rev. J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., of Philadelphia. They follow some volumes, previously noticed, by the same author, which have had a large circulation. They are of the same earnest evangelical note, with constant reference to the work of the Holy Spirit in the Christian life of to-day. Their titles are *The Lost Crown* and *The Power of a Surrendered Life.*

The Rev. George S. Carson, M.A., has prepared a *Primary Catechism* (Oliphant, 1½d.), and the Rev. T. B. Stephenson, D.D., has prepared a *Manual of Christian Doctrine and Duty* (H. Marshall, 1d.). They are both simple, but Mr. Carson's is the simpler. They are both orthodox, and again Mr. Carson's is the more orthodox. Dr. Stephenson's, however, is more ethical, and will be relished by the greater body of teachers.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE CREEDS. By A. E. Burn, B.D. (*Methuen.* 8vo, pp. xiv, 323. 10s. 6d.)

Mr. Burn is our freshest informant on the Creeds of Christendom. He has travelled Europe, and inspected the original or most ancient manuscripts in all the great libraries. He has digested the latest literature. And he can think. This is a student's book. It is prepared directly in view of the Cambridge Theological Tripos. But it will interest and instruct every person who cares to be interested and can be instructed on this great subject.

Besides the Creeds proper, Mr. Burn gives us a chapter on the 'Te Deum.' He accepts Dom Morin's suggestion that the author was Bishop Niceta of Ramesiana, whose date is given by Gennadius as 370–420. This suggestion is as old as Archbishop Ussher, who found a collection of Latin and Irish hymns, in which the 'Te Deum'

was assigned to Niceta. Professor J. H. Bernard of Dublin identified this collection with the Irish Book of Hymns belonging to the Franciscan Convent at Dublin, and published it with an introduction. From that point the proof has gone forward; and Mr. Burn so strengthens it now that little doubt seems left on the matter.

THE PRAYER BOOK AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Charles C. Tiffany, D.D. (*Murray.* Crown 8vo, pp. 176. 5s.)

The further title explains the book better: 'The Conception of the Christian Life implied in the Book of Common Prayer.' Thus it is not an introduction to the history, or even to the theology, of the Prayer Book; it is an exposition of its teaching about the life that every follower of Christ should live. It strikes us as an extremely useful book. Well written and reverent, it is also thoroughly practical. Its scholarship is unimpeachable, and its doctrinal position unassailable. To the reader of this timely volume the Prayer Book will carry more meaning and claim more allegiance.

THE ABIDING LAW. By the Rev. James Aitken, M.A. (*Oliphant.* Crown 8vo, pp. 191. 2s. 6d.)

The Decalogue makes an interesting historical study, but it serves its end best when it is obeyed. Mr. Aitken's purpose is to get it obeyed. He translates it into modern language and modern life. He lets it run into the very recesses of modern social life, and is not afraid to turn its light upon the fashions and frivolities of our day. He does not forget that salvation is not by keeping the commandments, but he remembers that there is no salvation without keeping the commandments. He is aware of the sweep Christ gave to these Ten Commandments, yet he insists upon their being kept. For he knows that He that spared not His own Son, will with Him freely give the power to keep the commandments. The twelve addresses of which the volume is composed are spoken to toiling earnest people.

THE ORIGINS OF SCOTTISH PRESBYTERY. By the Rev. A. Morris Stewart, M.A. (*Oliphant.* Crown 8vo, pp. viii, 88. 1s.)

Just at this time, when the great ecclesiastical question in Scotland is the question of the Union between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches, it is most opportune that we should receive a historical account of the origin of these Churches; and it is most fortunate that it has been so well done. The first chapter contains too much matter, and especially too many dates, to be easy reading. But after that it is all plain and pleasant sailing. The publishers have issued the book in a most attractive form and at a remarkably low price; so that it is altogether likely to prove successful at this time, and will give a better understanding of what men are doing in seeking this Union, and probably also a keener desire to seek it.

Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier have done a wise thing in publishing a *Selection of Rutherford's Letters* from Dr. Andrew Bonar's edition, and letting us have it at a cheap price (1s.), and in an attractive, lasting form. No more useful devotional gift could be given.

Messrs. Oliphant have issued a beautiful edition of Mr. Sheldon's allegory, *One of the Two.* Let it be noted that it is the copyright edition, and that it can be had from these publishers only.

Messrs. Parlane of Paisley have published a volume of *Morning and Evening Prayers* for one week, which have been collected and edited by the Rev. William Cowan, M.A., of Banchory. There is more sensitiveness to the spirituality of prayer in the volume than in any small collection we have seen. They may not suit a big gathering of all sorts and conditions of people; they are not general or indefinite enough for that. But Mr. Cowan believes that in prayer we may do more than recognize God's providence and ask for refreshing sleep. He believes that we may commune with the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And he has made his choice from the most spiritual sources of all times. Besides the morning and evening prayers, there are Prayers for Special Occasions, brief, definite, reverential. It is altogether a notable addition to a branch of literature that needs such a chastened addition sadly. The volume is cheap and accessible, being issued at one shilling.

Flowers of Gold is a small volume of addresses to children by the Rev. Andrew Aitken. (Kirkwall: Peace.) The addresses are very happy. The author gets right down among the children, and

does not mind astonishing them now and then, as Lewis Carrol used to do with his bear's skin on.

A Short Way out of Materialism is written by the Rev. Hubert Handley, M.A., and published by Messrs. Rivingtons (1s. net). Mr. Handley believes that conversion is more likely to take place by one good argument being driven well home than by many arguments left unread; so he uses the single argument that seen matter depends on the seeing eye—and the seeing eye is *me*: 'I am mind,' in Carlyle's glad exclamation.

The second volume of the 'Oxford Church Text-Books' has been written by the general editor, the Rev. E. Leighton Pullan, M.A. Its subject is *Early Christian Doctrine* (Rivingtons, 1s.). It is a clever sketch of Church doctrine from its simplest form in the Gospels to its expression in the Council of Chalcedon, 451 A.D. Mr. Pullan has succeeded in putting much matter into little space, and yet in writing a book that it is pleasant to read.

RESEARCHES INTO THE ORIGIN OF THE PRIMITIVE CONSTELLATIONS OF THE GREEKS, PHŒNICIANS, AND BABYLONIANS. By Robert Brown, Jun., F.S.A., M.R.A.S. (*Williams & Norgate.* 8vo, pp. 361. 10s. 6d.)

So much has been done now in the publication of Babylonian and other tablets that it is possible to make hopeful research into the primitive astronomy, and to reach conclusions that are approachably scientific and final. Mr. Brown claims no more than that. But he claims that, and makes it good. He has no revolutionary theories; his work is on the lines of the great scholars; but he is original and painstaking, making actual new contributions to the subject. Moreover, he has succeeded in retaining the reader's interest throughout, no doubt by the simple process of being always interested himself. This volume is the first of two. It carries the history of the constellations through the Hellenic period. The second will trace the Signs from the age of Alexander back to the dawn of history—a period of deeper and yet more difficult interest.

Contributions and Comments.

Professor Hommel on Hos. v. 11, with a Suggestion on Baasha.

If Professor Hommel read rather more widely in English literature, he would be aware of the error into which he has fallen in supposing that he was the first person to stir English students up to a more sedulous cultivation of biblical archæology as a helper to biblical criticism. It was in England and not in Germany that the Society of Biblical Archæology was formed, and at the present time there is plenty of archæological interest among biblical scholars. Professor Hommel's suggestion for Hos 5^{11} will, I fear, not stand a serious examination. That צו is wrong is clear; no Assyrian god of that name is known; the context speaks of Assyria. But שו, read by G, is only less wrong. The right reading must surely be אַשּׁוּר. הלך אחרי is not necessarily a ritual phrase; just here, it is explained by Hos 8^{9}, 'For they have gone up to Assyria . . .; to מצרים (the land of Muṣri), to give love-presents.' הלך אחרי means 'he has, like a lover, gone after.' In Hos 8^{9}, Wellhausen's correction is right (מצרים יחנו); but in Hos 5^{11a}, עשק ורצץ is wrong. Read עָשׁוּק אֶפְרַיִם וְרָצוּץ מִשְׁפָּטוֹ (cf. Dt 28^{33}). The whole verse runs, 'Ephraim is oppressed and crushed by its rulers, because he chose to go after Assyria.' The 'love-presents' involved heavy taxation. I hope that Professor Hommel, who, in The Expository Times for March, was so much in favour of textual criticism, will not be displeased at the objection which I raise to his undue conservatism in April. The Moonlight God has surely no place in Hosea. I would ask, however, whether Wellhausen's suggestion (*Heidenthum*, p. 62) in explanation of the name Baasha (בעשא from בעל-שא) may not receive light from Professor Hommel's statement? May not the god שא, whom Wellhausen only suspects in the name Baasha, be the god Ṣaw? I know Professor Hommel (*Anc. Heb. Trad.* p. 274) suspects Baasha to contain a fragment of the divine name Asit (cf. W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 316 f.). But he will be open, I am sure, to a new idea (see Wellhausen, *l.c.*).

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

Hos. v. 11 b and the Moon's Light.

HAVING been just engaged in an attempt to test the difficult passage, Hos 5^{11}, from the stylistic point of view, I was extremely surprised to read in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 329 f.) that Professor Hommel discovers a divine name in the words כִּי הוֹאִיל הָלַךְ אַחֲרֵי־צוֹ (v. ^{11b}). Hence I cannot avoid examining the grounds which led the author of this theory to start it, and I hope thereby to render a service also to other readers of this magazine.

1. Four grounds are adduced by Professor Hommel. But (*a*) why does he say that 'after the expression הָלַךְ אַחֲרֵי we should clearly expect the name of a god'? Has this expression always a divine name for object? I have examined the whole of the O.T. passages where it occurs, and the result is as follows: הָלַךְ אַחֲרֵי has for its object (α) a human personality in Gn 24^{61} 32^{20} 37^{17}, Jg 9^{49} 13^{11}, 1 S 11^{7} $17^{13f.}$ 25^{42}, 1 K 13^{14} 16^{3} $19^{20f.}$, 2 K 17^{15}, Hos $2^{7.15}$, Ru 3^{10}; (β) a thing, in Jos $6^{9.13}$, 2 S 3^{31}, 2 K 13^{2} ('he followed the sins of Jeroboam'); (γ) Jahweh, in Dt 13^{5}, 2 K 23^{3}, Hos 11^{10}, 2 Ch 34^{31}; (δ) other gods, in Dt 6^{14} 8^{19} 11^{28} 13^{3} 28^{14} 31^{16} ('the gods of the strangers'), Jg $2^{12.19}$, 1 K 11^{10}, Jer $7^{6.9}$ 11^{10} 13^{10} 16^{11} $26^{6.15}$; (ε) specifically Baal or the name of some other god, in Dt 4^{3}, 1 K 11^{5} 18^{18}, Jer 2^{23} 9^{13}; (ζ) (הלך) אַחֲרֵי הַתֹּהוּ 1 S 12^{21}, אַחֲרֵי הַגִּלּוּלִים 1 K 21^{26}, ה' א' הַהֶבֶל Ezk 20^{30}, ה' א' שִׁקּוּצִים 2 K 17^{15}, Jer 2^{5}, cf. v.^{8}; (η) 'after their own thoughts,' etc., Is 65^{2}, Jer 3^{17} 9^{13} 16^{12} 18^{12}, Ezk 33^{31}; 'after their own spirit,' Ezk 13^{3}; 'after mine eyes,' Job 31^{7}. From all this it is plain that Professor Hommel's first argument proves nothing.

(*b*) Did the Septuagint 'with its ὀπίσω τῶν ματαίων evidently take צו for a hidden divine name'? The Greek translator certainly renders as if he had read וְאֲנִי: שָׁוְא, for שָׁוְא is reproduced by μάταιος in Ex 23^{1}, etc., Is 30^{28}, Ezk $30^{6ff.}$ 22^{28} (although שָׁוְא answers to προφάσεις in Hos 10^{4}, and to ψευδεῖς in 12^{11}), Jon 2^{9}, Mal 3^{14}, Ps 12^{3}, etc. But this proves nothing more than either that he actually found שָׁוְא in his text, or that he put the term *shaw* in place of the similarly sounding word *ṣaw*, both שׁ and צ being regularly reproduced in Greek by σ (Könnecke, *Die Behandlung der hebräischen Eigennamen in der Septuaginta*, p. 14). For instance, שֵׁת appears as Σήθ, and צִיּוֹן as Σιών. If the Greek translator found *ṣaw* in his text, it is evident from ὀπίσω τῶν ματαίων that either his ear or his eye identified it with *shaw*. It is not certain that he could not have rendered it otherwise. At all events, it cannot be inferred from the LXX that the Greek translator found in *ṣaw* a hidden divine *name*.

(*c*) Professor Hommel argues that a divine name צו or צא occurs in Palmyrene and S. Arabian inscriptions. Now, the three Palmyrene names cited by Professor Hommel have been for a long time well known. Graf Melchior de Vogüé mentioned them in his *Syrie centrale* (pp. 33, 49, 51, 117), and they may be found also in Baethgen's *Beiträge zur semit. Religionsgeschichte*, Bd. i. p. 91: תימצא, אמתצא, עבדצו. There it was suggested that צו and צא might be abbreviations of the divine name רצו which is present, *e.g.*, in תימרצו. This view is of course untenable, but Baethgen is right in holding that the רצו of the Palmyrene inscriptions 'is perhaps identical with the god רִצָא who was known to the Arabs.' Compare the words of Osiander in his 'Studien über die vorislamische Religion der Araber' (*ZDMG*, Bd. vii. pp. 463 ff., 499): 'In Naǵd worship was offered to Rudâ (رِضاءٌ and رِضًا [رضا, pronounced *ridâ'un* or *rid'un*, 'favor, beneplacitum']) . . . But we see from the use of the proper name عبد رضاء that this cult had been naturalized also among other tribes, particularly the Jamanic tribes dwelling in the north.'—Now, the same divine name is found, besides this, in an inscription of S. W. Arabia, in which the consonantal group במחרצו is read, and we are reminded of the Ethiopic ሞሀሌ 'misertus est.' It is quite true that both the Palmyrene צו or צא and the S. Arabian צו may be identified with ضوء (*ḍau'un*) or ضوء (*ḍû'un*), 'light.' For the Aramaic צ frequently answers to the Arabic ض. Wright, in his *Comparative Grammar* (chap. iv.), compares, *e.g.*, ⲥⲙⲏ with ضمد and ⲑⲱⲙ (*ḍamáda*, 'iunxit'). Further, it is to be remembered that the Palmyrene inscriptions date from the first century A.D.

(*d*) Professor Hommel adds that 'the northern kingdom of Israel was characterized by syncretism in idolatry, and was specially devoted to the star-cult.' He has quoted no evidence for this; but

even if he had appealed to Am 5^{26}, it would *not* be 'certain that Hos 5^{11} ought to be rendered, "because Ephraim followed willingly the god Ẓaw."'

2. Let us now examine the other side of the picture.

(*a*) The prophet Hosea reproaches the inhabitants of the kingdom of Israel with their worship of Baʿal, $2^{10.\ 15.\ 19}$ 11^{2} 13^{1} ('Ephraim became guilty through the Baʿal'); cf. 'your fathers went to Baal-peor,' 9^{10}. That is to say, five times over he expressly mentions the cult of Baʿal, and specifies this as the source of Ephraim's guilt. (By the way, the terms עשתרות or אשרוה are not found in Hos.) Further, the idols are derided in Hos 2^{10} [Eng. 8] 8^{4} 13^{2a} 14^{4} [Eng. 3], and in particular the cult of the steers, which king Jeroboam had caused to be set up at Bethel and Dan as symbols of Jahweh, is referred to no fewer than four times by Hosea: 8^{5} ('thy calf') ^{6} 10^{5} 13^{2b}. The old name *Bethel* is, on account of this cult, transformed into *Bethawen*, 'house of vanity' (4^{16} 5^{8} 10^{5}), or into the simple *Awen*, 'vanity,' *i.e.* 'idolatry' (10^{8}; cf. 12^{12a}); and the high-places of Awen are called 'the sin of Israel' (10^{8}). Is it likely, then, that in 5^{11} Hosea should trace the oppression of Ephraim to its having been willing to walk after the moon's light?

Again, it is the case that Hos 5^{11a} has a passive sense. Nowack, indeed, alters the traditional participial forms from passive to active (*Hdkomm.*, 1897, *ad loc.*); but this proceeds upon a non-recognition of the *chiasmus* relation between v.^{10} and v.^{11}. That is to say, while in v.^{10} the ground of punishment comes first and then the punishment itself, the reverse is the case in v.^{11}, where the suffering is first described and then its cause assigned. Then v.^{12}, by a kind of palindrome, looks back to God as the ultimate author of the misfortunes of both portions of the covenant people. The evil fate of Ephraim is described in Hos 5^{11a} in language like that employed in Dt 28^{33}, 'Thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed always,' and this is said in both passages 'in connexion with invasion' (Cheyne in the *Cambridge Bible*, on Hos 5^{11}). Is it likely that this misfortune of Ephraim should be traced to the worshipping of a deity who is named nowhere else either in Hos or in the other books of the Old Testament? Would not the ruin of a nation be naturally traced to what we might call an official aberration on their part? But if the cult of the god *Ẓaw* had been such, would it have been named only in this one passage? No, it is far from probable that in Hos 5^{11b} there is allusion to the worship of the god *Ẓaw*. This passage is insufficiently cleared up by connecting it with the moonlight, and this connexion would not be certain even if it should remain doubtful which of the three following interpretations of Hos 5^{11b} is the correct one.

(*b*) May the prophet have said 'because he resolved to follow vanity (= idolatry)?' This is the interpretation adopted by LXX, Pesh., Arab. V.S. (cf. מֵמוֹן הִשְׁקֶר of the Targum), G. A. Smith (*Twelve Prophets*, vol. i. (1896) p. 262), Kautzsch (*A. T.* (1896)), Nowack (*Hdkomm.*, 1897, *cit. loc.*), and Valeton (*Amos und Hosea*, 1898, p. 216). Well, שָׁוְא is undoubtedly used in other cases than the present supposed one without the article; for instance we actually find it so in Hos 10^{4} 12^{12}. Or, again, אוֹן (*'awen* = *μάταιος* Is 31^{2} and = *μάταια* Ezk 11^{2}, Hos 6^{8}) might have been changed into צוֹ (cf. הֹלֵךְ] אַחֲרֵי הַהֹוא [$1\ S\ 12^{21}$). But upon this theory a more familiar word (אָוֶן or שָׁוְא) would have been changed into a less familiar one (צוֹ). Is not the opposite more likely to have happened?

(*c*) Was צוֹא intended? Has the present reading צָו וַאֲנִי arisen from a haplography of וא? Did the prophet mean to say 'because he was willing to follow filthiness'? The unseemly conduct of Israel is certainly censured in strong language in Hos $4^{11ff.}$, *e.g.* in the words, 'Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart,' or 'the spirit of whoredoms hath caused them to err,' etc. In point of fact, Abr. Geiger in his well-known work, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (p. 411), suggests צוֹ, *ẓô*, as the original reading. The Massoretic pronunciation *ẓaw* would then be an euphemistic *Ḳerê*, similar to the transformations of *ẓô* and *ẓô'ā*, which Geiger—without certain evidence—assumes in Is 30^{22b}, Ezk 26^{18b} $47^{3a.\ 8b.\ 11}$. This explanation is not absolutely impossible, but it does not appear to be the most probable.

(*d*) Hosea several times condemns the origin of the monarchy in Israel as a source of national division (8^{4} 10^{3} $13^{10f.}$). How much more natural that the prophet should bewail the arrangement whereby Jeroboam I. had destroyed the religious unity of the people of Jahweh! Hence it is not altogether out of the question to suppose that

what Hosea said in 5^{11} was 'because he was willing to follow a commandment.' Gesenius (*Thes.*, *s.v.* צו) says, indeed: 'nusquam dicitur *ire post mandatum* pro *sequi mandatum*.' But this *dictum* is of no importance. 'Walk after a commandment' might just as well be said as 'walk after their own thoughts,' *i.e.* their design or will (Is 65^{2}), or 'walk after our own devices' (Jer 18^{12}), etc. And is there not a good parallelism between 'broken in *judgment*' and 'follow a *commandment*'? Besides, something must be meant which would suit the somewhat remarkable 'because he *resolved*,' etc. Finally, whatever is referred to must be a peculiarity of Ephraim. Is it then so wholly improbable that the 'precept of men' (Is 29^{13}) is intended, by which Jeroboam I. exercised so destructive an influence; and might not this human precept be in a way ironically treated by the choice of צַו, *ṣaw*, which is actually put in Is $28^{10.13}$ in the mouth of scoffers?

(*e*) In any case, the condition of Hos 5^{11b} does not appear to me to be such as to justify one in following Wellhausen (*Die kleinen Propheten*[3], 1898), who treats it as so unintelligible that he represents it in his translation of Hosea simply by a series of dots (. . . . .).

Ed. König.

Rostock.

'Dr. Petavel on Immortality.'

A friend of mine has sent me a copy of The Expository Times for March, containing an article by the Rev. Frank Ballard under the title, 'Dr. Petavel on Immortality.' Allow me to say that my views are not correctly represented in that article. I beg therefore to refer the writer and your readers to my chief work, which he has carefully ignored, viz. *The Problem of Immortality*,[1] containing as it does the result of thirty years' prayerful study and extensive research. Let me add that I have not found in Mr. Ballard's statements a single objection which I am not prepared to answer if only space permitted.

E. Petavel.

Geneva.

[1] Translated from the French by F. A. Freer. Elliot Stock, London, 1892. 597 pages in 8vo.

Was Tyre taken by Nebuchadrezzar?

This question was suggested by the following words of Professor Sayce (*Early Israel and the Surrounding Nations*, p. 240): 'The turn of Tyre came next. For thirteen years it was patiently blockaded, and in 573 B.C. it passed, with its fleet, into Nebuchadrezzar's hands.' What we desire to know is whether there is evidence (inscriptional or otherwise) that the city was not only besieged but *taken*. If so, it appears to be unknown to Professor Hommel who, in the article 'Babylonia' in the new Dictionary of the Bible (vol. i. p. 229^{a}), writes: 'Tyre, however, in spite of a thirteen years' siege, *could not be taken*, but had to resume payment of the former tribute.'

As far as we are aware, the data for reaching a conclusion are as follows:—Ezekiel, a contemporary of Nebuchadrezzar, seems distinctly to imply ($29^{18ff.}$) that his own predictions (chaps. 26–28) had not been fulfilled, and that Egypt was to fall a prey to the Babylonian monarch by way of compensation for his failure to capture Tyre. This, which is Smend's interpretation, appears the most natural, although we are quite ready to admit that, were there any evidence to support it, Ewald's view (which is really borrowed from Jerome; see below), that the city was captured but yielded no considerable amount of spoil, might be covered by the language of the prophet.

Josephus (*c. Ap.* i. 21, cf. *Art.* x. 11. 1), writing some six hundred years after the date in question, professes to quote Phœnician authorities to the effect that Tyre was *besieged* by Nebuchadrezzar in the days of Ithobal *for thirteen years*, but he says nothing as to its capture.

Jerome, writing nearly one thousand years after the time, states (*ad* Ezk 29^{18}) that '*captâ urbe*' no treasures were found in it, but he as good as admits (*ad* 26^{7}) that there was no historical evidence as to the issue of the siege. Hence his statement is probably a mere assumption supposed to be necessitated by the Old Testament.

We presume that there is evidence for Professor Hommel's statement that the city had to resume payment of the former tribute, and it would be interesting to have from him or from Professor Sayce an exact quotation of the terms of any tablets upon whose authority this is asserted. Still more welcome would be any evidence that

would justify Professor Sayce's categorical statement that Tyre was taken.

As to Professor Sayce's communication in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (April, p. 332), I have no wish to prolong the controversy, my main object in writing having been gained, namely, to emphasize the true character of Dr. Scheil's Deluge Tablet, and to point out, what it appeared to me that Professor Sayce himself ought to have pointed out, that the (correct) account he gave of the contents of the Tablet in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES was diametrically opposed to his former account of it in the Preface to his *Early History of the Hebrews*. The only difference between us now is that I attached more importance to that Preface than its author appears to have done. J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

Pharaoh's Butler and the Cup.

IN his 'Archæological Commentary on Genesis' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, January 1899, p. 171), Dr. A. H. Sayce says: 'Instead of hearing of grape-juice being squeezed into Pharaoh's cup, we ought to hear of the wine being poured into it.'

Are we to understand by this that Dr. Sayce rejects the plain words of the narrative, and insists that the contents of the cup must have been fermented?

The question is one which has often been discussed. The fullest and most careful treatment of the passage known to me occurs in *The Temperance Bible Commentary*, by Dr. F. R. Lees and Dr. Dawson Burns, 1868, where the opinions of authorities, ancient and modern, are cited and discussed. The authors point out that the balance of evidence is strongly in favour of the literal description being not only possible, but highly probable. Indeed, the presumption is that in ancient times wine was forbidden altogether to the priests of On, and also to the Pharaohs, who were of the priestly order. In support of this contention they quote a passage from Plutarch's 'Treatise on Osiris and Isis' (sec. 6), citing Eudoxus, a learned Greek who had visited Egypt (*d.* 340), as affirming, on the authority of the Egyptian priests, that until the reign of Psammeticus (640 B.C.) the Pharaohs drank no wine.

One or two quotations from this passage may be interesting. 'As to wine, they who wait upon the gods in the city of the sun carry absolutely none into the temple as something not seemly to drink in the daytime. . . . Even the kings themselves, being of the order of priests, have their wine given to them according to a certain measure as prescribed in the sacred books. They began to drink (wine) from the time of Psammetichus, previous to which they drank no wine at all. . . . These things are related by Eudoxius in the second book of the Tour, as he had them from the priests themselves.'

That fresh, unfermented grape-juice is a pleasant, refreshing, and nutritious drink cannot be doubted. Thousands of people use it to-day by preference in the Communion service and as an article of diet. The above quotation shows that fresh grape-juice would have been a suitable offering to a Pharaoh of Joseph's age, whereas an intoxicating wine would not. Do not, therefore, modern practice and ancient custom justify us in accepting the plain statement of the Butler's dream as the usual custom of the Egyptian court at that day?

WILLIAM LOWER CARTER.

Hopton Manse, Mirfield.

Ignatius 'Ad Romanos.'

IN a recent number of the *Critical Review* Professor Lindsay maintains, as against M. Bruston, the authenticity of Ignatius to the Romans. Closely examined, his argument rests solely upon the testimony of Eusebius. How precarious a foundation this is will be apparent from a study of the critical method of the early Church historian. The plan of Eusebius was simple; he accepted as genuine what was generally so received in his day. Thus, with regard to his treatment of the canon of the Scriptures, Eusebius does no more than adduce testimonies to books *disputed in his time* (*H.E.* iii. 3); he is content to receive all the rest. Is it likely that he would be more critical towards books for which canonicity had never been claimed? Again, supposing that this were otherwise, is the evidence of Eusebius invariably reliable? Scarcely, since he describes Papias in one place as a learned man (*H.E.* iii. 36), and elsewhere desribes him as *σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν* (iii. 39). Moreover, the age in which Eusebius

lived was not remarkable for critical acumen; and, on the whole, it would appear that, unless it can be shown that the Ignatian letter to the Romans was doubted in his time, the fact that Eusebius received it as genuine is no proof of its authenticity. Internal evidence is our only safe guide; and under this head M. Bruston makes out a good case against the Roman letter. Two points alone seem conclusive. In the letters to the Churches of Asia Minor, Ignatius describes himself as *a deacon* (Eph. ii.; Magn. ii.; Philad. iv.; Smyrn. xii.); in the Roman letter he is a bishop. Again, in the letters to the Asian Churches, Ignatius speaks moderately about martyrdom, neither will he seek it nor shirk it; but the Roman letter contains the most extravagant language on the subject. Is it probable that these lines, *e.g.*, would have been penned *from Smyrna*, some time before the actual martyrdom: Σιτός εἰμὶ Θεοῦ καὶ δι' ὀδόντων θηρίων ἀλήθωμαι ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄρτος εὑρεθῶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ? F. H. Fisher.

The Rectory, Pretoria, S. Africa.

More Critical Gleanings in Job.

Job 3[4.5].—Who has not been thrilled by Job's passionate exclamations, even in the somewhat obscure Authorized Version? Has the most recent commentator succeeded in removing its obscurities? If he has, warm thanks are due to him. Unfortunately, Professor Duhm (1897) repeats the ordinary interpretation of כְּמְרִירֵי יוֹם (A.V. 'the blackness of the day'), without that qualifying adverb 'probably' which Professor Davidson prefixed to his explanation in 1884. That כמרירי יום is possible as Hebrew, Professor Duhm has not shown. In the *Expositor*, v. (1897), 406, I pointed out the extreme doubtfulness of a root כמר, 'to be black,' and in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, ix. (1897), 975, I expressed the opinion that כמרירי יום springs from כְּמוֹ אֹרְרֵי יָם, and that the whole line ('Let them affright it like those who lay a ban on the ocean') is a gloss on v.[8a], and is therefore to be deleted. There is a trace of the right reading in 𝔊's rendering: καταραθείη ἡ ἡμέρα (יום however should be יָם, as Gunkel showed). That Duhm should assent to Bickell's principle of a four-line stanza is gratifying. Probably my own approval of this principle in the *Expositor* was not sufficiently absolute; I could now repair my omission. Together with Bickell and Beer I hold that v.[4a] is intrusive. Like its counterpart, v.[6a], it implies an artificial distinction between a curse on the day and a curse on the night of Job's birth. Duhm, however, considers that הַיּוֹם in v.[4a] should be הַלַּיְלָה, and that with this correction the line may stand as the third in the first stanza. To me, however, ἡ νὺξ ἐκείνη in v.[4a] according to 𝔊, is plainly due to the influence of ἡ νὺξ ἐκείνη in the preceding line; M.T. is right, but the line is a later insertion. Besides, the line is without a parallel. Duhm, it is true, fetches one from v.[9], which has one stichos too many. But יקו לאור ואין does not make a perfect parallel to הלילה ההוא יהי חשך, and if it were misplaced, one would rather expect to find it at the *end* of a verse, instead of interrupting two stichi which plainly belong together. I am also unable to assent to Duhm in his defence of 'pyramids' as a rendering for חֳרָבוֹת (3[14]). I admit, however, that the houses filled with silver, in v.[15b], are most likely those grand sepulchres, which were popularly supposed to contain vast treasures, and no longer adopt Olshausen's ארמנות (not one of Job's words). The true reading *must be* קְבָרוֹת, 'graves,' and לָמוֹ should be עוֹלָם.

Another new correction strikes me as only possible. In 3[4b] I am not satisfied with the ἅπαξ λεγόμ. נהדה (not to be read in Sir 43[1]). The scribe may have thought of Aram. נְהוֹרָא, 'day-light.' 𝔊 gives φέγγος, but the Targ. has שפרפרא, 'the morning-star.' Some heavenly body seems to be meant. The stars appear in v.[9]; should we not expect the moon, and read, לבנה? לב would very easily indeed fall out after ליו; רה would be inserted by an editor to make sense.

The stanzas most affected by the above note, may be rendered thus—

1. Perish the day on which I was to be born,
   And the night, which said, Behold, a boy!
   Let not God above ask after it,
   Let not the moon show her splendour above it!

2. That night—let it be barren,
   Let not a joyous cry be heard in it!
   Let them curse it that lay a spell on the ocean,
   Who have skill to arouse Leviathan!

3. Let the stars of its twilight remain dark,
Let it not look (with pleasure) on the eyelids of the dawn,
Because it shut not up the gates of my birth,
And hid not anguish from my eyes.

4. For then I should have lain still and rested,
I should have slumbered, then I should have had quiet,
With kings and counsellors of the earth,
Who built everlasting sepulchres.

Job 5^3.—'Suddenly I cursed his habitation' cannot be right. Siegfried (in Haupt's Bible) and others would read וְרָקַב for וָאֶקּוֹב; Duhm, וַיִּרְקַב; 'suddenly his habitation became rotten.' 𝔊 suggested this: *ἐὐθέως ἐβρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ δίαιτα.* Budde prefers וַיִּפָּקֵד, 'became empty.' Bevan (*Journal of Philology*, 1899), וַיִּבַּק, with the same sense. In the articles referred to I have suggested וַיּוּקַב, 'was cursed (by God)'; cf. Nu 23^8. But I fancy there is an error not only in ואקוב but in נוהו. 'Root and branch' or 'root and blossom' are elsewhere in antithesis. The passage would be in order if we read v.^{3b}, וַיִּרְקַב עֲנָפוֹ פתאם, 'but suddenly his branches became rotten.' (Cf. Ps $80^{10.11}$, Mal 3^{19}, שֹׁרֶשׁ and עָנָף opposed.)

Job 7^1, and connected passages—

Is there not a warfare to man upon earth?
And are not his days like the days of a hireling?

So R.V. renders this pathetic passage. But is 'warfare' satisfactory? Duhm renders—

Hat nicht die Frohn der Mensch auf Erden,
Ist Fröhners Leben nicht sein Leben?

But have we a right to render צבא as if it were from the same root as יָשַׁכִּיר? Of course, Duhm only aims here at a *free* rendering. There are three passages in which צבא is said to mean 'drudgery' or the like—Job 7^1 14^{14}, and Is 40^2. In all these passages צָבָא is miswritten for עֹצֶב. In Job 7^1 read הֲלֹא לְעֹצֶב אֱנוֹשׁ יִוָּלֵד, 'Is not man born to pain?' In Job 14^{14} read כָּל־יְמֵי עָצְבִּי אֲיַחֵל, 'all my days of pain would I wait.' In Is 40^2, which is alluded to in Is 14^3, read כִּי הִשְׁלִים עָצְבָּהּ, 'that He has brought his pain to an end'; the following clauses also need correction (see *Isaiah*, Haupt's Hebrew Bible).

Job 7^{17-18}.—'The admiring gratefulness of the Psalmist that God condescended to visit man, and gave him such a place in His estimation is parodied by Job' (Davidson). This is, in fact, the received view, and is restated by Duhm. I am strongly convinced that we critics have been wrong. The 'parody' is imaginary; it disappears when we correct (as we must) תִּפְקְדֶנּוּ into תִּצְרְפֶנּוּ. Just so, פקדת should certainly be צרפת (or better, תצרף) in Ps 17^3.

Job 7^{15-16}—

So that my soul chooseth strangling,
And death rather than these my bones.
I loathe (my life); I would not live alway:
Let me alone, for my days are vanity.

So R.V. Just before, Job has given a selection of some of his symptoms. It is thought (*e.g.* by Davidson) that the speaker prefers one of these symptoms, one of these experiences, to the rest, because there is a chance that it may lead to the wished-for end — death. I do not think that this is at all natural. If the text be accepted, we must surely interpret it as an expression of desire to commit suicide. And if this be pronounced inconsistent with Job's character as a righteous man, then the text must be corrupt; 𝔊 at anyrate read quite differently, and, like Pesh., made God the subject. The true reading can, I think, be restored. מות in v.^{15b} is a mutilation of מאסתי, and this word is miswritten for נואשתי, and misplaced. Read—

וַתִּבְרַח בַּעֲנָקוֹת נַפְשִׁי
נוֹאַשְׁתִּי מֵעַצְבוֹתָי:
לֹא־לְעֹלָם אֶחְיֶה כִּי־אֶיחֶל

So that my breath flees away in sighs,
I am in despair because of my pains.
Not for ever shall I live, that I should wait, etc.

כִּי־אֶיחֶל is a correction of כִּי־אֵרִיךְ, which latter misreading is presupposed by 𝔊.

Job 11^{17}—

And thy life shall be clearer than the noonday;
Though there be darkness, it shall be as the morning.

So R.V.; but the text is plainly wrong. קוּם cannot borrow the sense of זָרַח, 'to beam,' and תְּעֻפָּה, though grammatically not indefensible, is yet in the very highest degree improbable. Hitzig, Duhm, and others read תְּעֻפָה, but such a word is unknown. 𝔊 gives ἡ εὐχή σου=תְּפִלָּתְךָ. This is obviously a corruption of אַפְלָתְךָ (cf. Is 58^{10}).

Line 1 should be corrected so as to correspond to 10^{20}, where several critics read חֲלֹא־מְעַט יְמֵי חֶלְדִּי. Read—

וְכַצָּהֳרַיִם יְמֵי חֶלְדֵּךְ

And the days of thy life (shall be) as the noonday,
And thy darkness shall be as the morning.

Job 13^{12b}.—לְגַבֵּי חֹמֶר גַּבֵּיכֶם: R.V. 'your defences are defences of clay'; similarly, Budde. Duhm, however, 'Zu Lehmschilder werden eure Schilde'. Duhm's rendering is favoured by the use of גַּבֵּי ('bosses') in 15^{26} (גַּבֵּי מָגִנָּיו); he adduces עַצְמוֹתֵיכֶם in Is 41^{21} as a parallel expression. But surely this able critic has not hit the mark on this occasion. עצ is certainly corrupt (see Hebrew *Isaiah* in Haupt's Old Testament). The versions (Beer) do not help us; but the mention of clay (חֹמֶר) should at once suggest נֵבֶל or נִבְלֵי. גביכם might be גַּבְהֲכֶם, 'your pride' (ג absolutely, as Jer 48^{29}), but more probably has become corrupted from כְּבוֹדְכֶם (cf. Is 22^{24}). The Assyrian *ikbi*, 'I said' (Lagarde), has nothing to do with the matter. We may now attempt to restore v.^{12a}. זכרניכם (which all the critics retain) is certainly wrong. ב=ר; ש=ז; ח=כ. Read חִשְׁבֹנֵיכֶם, 'your artifices.' מִשְׁלֵי may perhaps mean '(are) the likeness (of)'; see Budde and Beer on 41^{25}. But more probably read יִמָּשְׁלוּ כְּאֵפֶר. Render—

Your artifices are no better than ashes;
Your glory is a clay bottle.

Job 13^{15}.—לֹא אֲיַחֵל: Davidson, 'I will not wait'; Duhm, 'I cannot hold out'; Budde, 'I hope for nothing.' The text is clearly wrong. The true reading, almost, if not quite certainly, is לֹא אֶחְדַּל, 'I will not desist.' So the whole passage becomes self-consistent. Come life, come death, Job will not desist from his self-justification.

Job 20^{7}.—כגללו, E.V. 'like his own dung.' Some of the occasional coarsenesses in the O.T. are clearly due to corruption of the text. Duhm and others refer to the Ar. *jalla*, camel-dung, used for fuel in the East (cf. Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, i. 305). Most improbable. Read, probably, כְּבוֹדוֹ 'his glory.' So the verse reads naturally. Cf. Ps 49^{18b}.

Job 20^{23}.—וְיִמְטֵר עָלָיו בְּלַחוּמוֹ: Davidson, 'And shall rain upon him his food.' Duhm corrects עָלָיו חֲמָתוֹ. מובל, he thinks, comes from מַבֶּל, a marginal gloss referring to the Deluge ($22^{15f.}$). But the analogy of many other places suggests that מו in עלימו is dittographic; it is no doubt produced by an error of the eye (cf. בלחומו); read עָלָיו. מַבֶּל does not occur, and מַבּוּל would be a perfectly gratuitous gloss. בלחומו is of course corrupt; the original reading must have been גֶּחָלִים. Beer nearly saw this, but only thought of פֶּחָם (Ps 11^{6}). The line becomes, 'And shall rain hot coals upon him.'

Job 26^{5}.—The passage as it stands is hopeless (see R.V.); some correction, as most admit, has to be made. A weak correction is quite hopeless. But if we act on the experience won from the study of other deeply corrupt passages, we shall find a remedy. Read probably—

רֹגֵעַ הַיָּם וְגַלָּיו
מְחַתֵּת מַיִם וְשִׁבֳּלֵיהֶם

Who causes to shrink (in alarm) the sea and its billows,
Who terrifies the waters and their currents.

Job 28^{18}.—וּמֶשֶׁךְ חָכְמָה מְפַנִינִים; R.V., 'Yea, the price of wisdom is above rubies'; Budde, 'Und Erwerb der Weisheit geht über Perlen'; Duhm, '*Sie* haben überwiegt Korallen.' Duhm's free rendering is suggestive. מֶשֶׁךְ='to possess (wisdom'; a verb being wanting, he supplies 'outweighs,' and for the idea compares Prov 8^{11}. Budde supplies a different verb, and renders מֶשֶׁךְ 'the acquisition (of wisdom).' Dillmann finds an allusion to the pearl-fishery. 'To capture wisdom is more than to capture pearls.' There is surely some error in the text. Comparing תִּסָּלֶה in v.^{19} I would read וּמִשְׁקַל, 'And the weight (value) of wisdom is greater than that of corals' (or perhaps 'pearls').

Job 30^{18}—

בְּרַב־כֹּחַ יִתְחַפֵּשׂ לְבוּשִׁי
כְּפִי כֻּתָּנְתִּי יַאַזְרֵנִי

R.V. renders—

By the great force (of my disease) is my garment disfigured:
It bindeth me about as the collar of my coat.

Recent commentators have displayed much ingenuity here. That the text is not right should be clear. I venture to offer a fresh suggestion

which may chance to be right. Duhm's change of כח to כחש, 'emaciation,' does not satisfy me. Job 16^8 will not prove this sense for the noun, nor Ps 109^{24} for the verb. Budde's rendering of ברב־כח ('durch Allgewalt') is also unsatisfactory; the context does not favour a reference to God's omnipotence. Siegfried suggests changing יתחפש into יְתַפֵּשׂ; LXX, ἐπελάβετο. But no one has touched v.^{18b}, though יאזרני at any rate cannot be correct. It strikes me that v.^{16} must be a duplicate of v.^{18}; compare the letters of the words in the respective verses. Now in v.^{16b} we find יאחזוני. יאחזני must, I think, be the right word, and not יאזרני. For כפי I read בפי. Render v.^{18}—

> By (his) great power he takes hold of my garment,
> By the opening of my tunic he grasps me.

This fits in admirably with v.^{19}. In *a* I follow Budde and Duhm in supposing אֵל to have fallen out of the text. The sense requires this.

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

The Day of the Crucifixion.

In The Expository Times for April an able and interesting contribution was made by Dr. E. W. G. Masterman to the vexed question whether our Lord was crucified on the 14th or 15th of Nisan. The following considerations are offered by way of supplement to his arguments, as they confirm the conclusion drawn, which the present writer has long believed to be the true one.

One point in Dr. Masterman's paper may be re-emphasized on account of its importance. The greater part of the apparent discrepancy between the Synoptists and St. John vanishes, so soon as it is recognized that they use the term 'Passover' in different senses. By it the former almost always means the Paschal sacrifice; but St. John employs it for the Paschal week of festival, including not only the sacrifice but also the observance of the following days of unleavened bread.

Two expressions strongly confirm the view that Judas purposely chose the night preceding 15th Nisan for the arrest, because then all were within doors, and no 'tumult' would arise. The first occurs in Jn 13^{30}. After recording that Judas 'having received the sop went out straightway,' St. John adds with unmistakable emphasis, 'and it was night.' The commentators either overpass the point or explain it in ways more fanciful than convincing. But it is explained at once if at the time the disciples felt surprise that Judas' errand was so urgent as to require him to set all the claims of custom aside and leave the house on the Passover night, when usage if not legal obligation required all to remain within until the morning. The other expression occurs in Lk 22^{53}. Jesus made indignant protest against the sneaking way in which his seizure was accomplished, when there had been daily opportunity as He was teaching in the temple; and then He added, 'But this is your hour and the power of darkness.' If the Sadducees had been plotting with Judas these several days, waiting for the one sacred night when all would be watching and worshipping indoors and silence would fall upon the streets, and had resolved to use the solemnity of that hour to achieve their evil purpose, what increased force do these words acquire! The hour of God's redemption of his people was become the hour of His foes and of the power of darkness!

Although not free from difficulties, an argument may be drawn from consideration of the year. The crucifixion took place almost certainly in 30 A.D. For on the one hand John's preaching began 'in the 15th year of Tiberius,' which at earliest would be September 27 A.D. Some time must be allowed for John's preaching before Jesus' baptism, then Jesus kept a Passover in Jerusalem (Jn 2^{13}), spent the season of another in Galilee (Jn 6^4), and suffered in Jerusalem at a third (Jn $12^{1.\ 12}$). The earliest possible date is therefore 30 A.D. On the other hand, St. Paul's second visit as a Christian to Jerusalem is fixed with good reason in 45–46 A.D., whence it follows (Gal 2^1) that his conversion was not later than 33 A.D. The date of the crucifixion could not therefore be later than 31 A.D., while 30 A.D. is likelier. Now there can be no doubt that the crucifixion fell on a Friday. How do these data affect the days of Nisan? Astronomical calculation proves that in 30 A.D. the moon was new on Wednesday, 22nd March, at 8 p.m., and consequently full during the night between Thursday and Friday, *i.e.* early on 7th April. If the Jews ate the Passover on the night of the full moon, the Thursday was 14th Nisan, and the Friday, 15th Nisan, on which the crucifixion took place. In no proximate year could the Passover have been eaten on either

Thursday or Friday evening, which corroborates the date 30 A.D.[1]

These arguments receive some confirmation from one of a less direct and negative character. Since the Gospels and the primitive conception of the Christian Sacrament alike prove the last Supper to have had a Paschal character, it must, unless it was the true Passover, have been arranged by Jesus as a quasi-Passover in advance. But in that case it would be very remarkable that no hint is anywhere given of so exceptional and striking a design. That Mt 26^{18} cannot mean this is clear from the parallels in Mk and Lk. This negative evidence certainly affords a presumption for the view that the meal was the Passover, and the following day was 15th Nisan.

E. P. Boys-Smith, M.A.,
Vicar of Hordle.

April 1899.

Literature of the Lord's Supper.

In the March number Dr. Rainy gives a list of the best books on the Lord's Supper. He omits, however, the 'best' of all those concerned with the Church of England. This is Vogan's *True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, a masterly exposition of the 'Church Doctrine,' which is really 'Bible Truth,' and a searching criticism of Pusey and R. Wilberforce. Vogan has never been seriously dealt with by writers of the extreme Anglican School.

W. H. Griffith Thomas.

London.

Hittite Decipherment.

I.

Would you permit me to protest against the extraordinary misrepresentations contained in Professor Jensen's references to Professor Sayce in the first three paragraphs of his article in your April number, p. 304? It would take time (of which I have none to spare) and space (of which you have scanty store) to show in detail how absurd, irrelevant, and misleading every clause referring to Professor Sayce is. Professor Jensen should confine himself to his praiseworthy work of completing and defending his own theory of interpretation (on which I express no judgment), without disfiguring his articles by absolutely misstating the position of a rival interpreter.

W. M. Ramsay.

Aberdeen.

[1] For the facts, but not the inference, *vide* Salmon's *Introduction*, p. 267.

II.

Professor Jensen wishes to know why I have not criticized in detail his attempts at Hittite decipherment, and imputes to me all sorts of strange motives for not having done so. The reason is very simple: I have not thought it worth my while to waste my time in useless controversy. Professor Jensen has too high an idea of his own infallibility to be convinced that he could be wrong, and those who wish can easily test for themselves the value of the conjectures which he has put forward. He has, however, forgotten that his 'decipherment' has now been actually examined in detail by Dr. Leopold Messerschmidt in his *Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Inschriften* (Berlin: Peiser, 1898), with the result that nothing is left of it. After Messerschmidt's exhaustive little book I may be excused for still preserving the same silence in regard to Professor Jensen's essays in decipherment that I have always observed in regard to those of his predecessors.

On one point, however, I can assure him that he is mistaken. Except at the outset of my Hittite studies, when like himself I was oversanguine of success, I have never attempted to decipher the Hittite inscriptions in the sense in which he uses the word. For years past I have maintained that, with our present materials, the task is hopeless. 'Graphic decipherment' is alone possible, thanks to the pictorial system of writing employed in them, and it is to this 'graphic decipherment' alone that I have devoted myself. It is a necessary preliminary to the interpretation of the texts, though it seems to me to have been neglected by Professor Jensen as well as by most of his predecessors.

So far am I from being convinced that my method has been superseded by Professor Jensen's, that for the first time for nearly twenty years I am about to publish some attempts I have been making to assign phonetic values to the Hittite signs. But such attempts are merely conjectures, more or less probable. I do not possess Professor Jensen's infallibility; and I believe that no certainty is attainable until our materials are more numerous, less mutilated, and more accurately copied.

A. H. Sayce.

Cairo, 12th April 1899.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It will soon be recognized that the second volume of the new Dictionary of the Bible (which has been sent for review) is of wider interest than the first. The painstaking student, slowly building up an accurate knowledge of the letter of Scripture, will work his way through the smaller articles. But the average reader will turn at once to the great subjects which fall so lavishly into this volume.

They are well distributed between the Old Testament and the New. Professor Ryle's 'Genesis,' Professor Driver's 'Habakkuk,' Professor Davidson's 'Hosea' and 'Jeremiah,' Professor Smith's 'Isaiah' and 'Joshua,' Professor Davison's 'Job,' Professor Cameron's 'Joel,' Professor König's 'Jonah' and 'Judges,' and Mr. Burney's 'Kings' are all articles of the best type of critical scholarship. And besides these books we must notice such subjects and persons falling within the Old Testament as Flood, Food, Genealogy, Glory, Hexateuch, Holiness, Idolatry, Jacob, Joseph. Of these we might single out the article Idolatry for special attention. It is not long, not nearly so long indeed as articles that have appeared in previous Dictionaries. But there is a distinction recognized between different kinds of idolatry found in the Old Testament, a grouping as contrasted with a mere repetition of the passages, which gives to such an article the value of science, and makes it useful to the most ignorant as well as the most accomplished reader.

But on the whole the New Testament has the best of it in this volume. The great doctrinal articles are mostly concerned with New Testament teaching. 'Glory' and 'Holiness' belong to both Testaments, and are handled by two different men. But Mr. Bethune-Baker's 'Forgiveness' is chiefly New Testament, while Principal Stewart's 'Grace,' Mr. Ottley's 'Incarnation,' Principal Simon's 'Justification,' and Professor Orr's 'Kingdom of God' are entirely so. Then there are the three great articles on 'God,' 'Jesus Christ,' and the 'Holy Spirit.' And besides the very full articles on 'Galatia' by Professor Ramsay, we have the whole subject of St. John and his writings, written by Mr. T. B. Strong of Christ Church, Oxford, Principal Salmond of Aberdeen, and the late Principal Reynolds of Cheshunt.

'I wonder if you are feeling the importance of the distinction between *sin* and *offences*, a distinction constantly lost sight of, so that men often cherish the former in their efforts to get rid of the latter. If men would but believe in the truth that *the sin is* taken away, instead of whitewashing and painting up the old Adam and attempting to get others to do the same, the

coming of the Lord would be apprehended and the glorification of the Son of Man be known in the power of the Holy Ghost.'

A small book called *Letters from a Mystic of the Present Day* has reached its third edition this month (Elliot Stock), and those words are quoted from it. They are followed by others which are more explicit. 'No sins are reckoned against us by God; on His side they are all put away—in relation to Him they have no existence. Hence our Lord says (Mt 9^2), Son, be of good cheer, thy sins *have been done away*.'

And the writer, who is the Rev. Rowland W. Corbet, M.A., Rector of Stoke-on-Terne, does not speak of Christians. He speaks of men—we were going to say of sinners. He speaks of those whom we used to call sinners. He says there are no sinners, except that in thinking themselves sinners they commit sin. He says there is no reckoning of sin against the prodigal in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. He says our Lord's Commission is to preach the gospel to every creature, and the gospel is that our sins are put away, are not reckoned against us by God. To quote him word for word: 'Our sin or error is in assuming that our sins or trespasses have a place in the mind of God.'

To get rid of sin, then, it is to get rid of the mistake of thinking that God regards us as sinners. 'When the heart recognizes this, it inbreathes the atmosphere which develops spiritual life into filial trust and brotherly love.' But if the heart never recognizes this, what then? 'There is therefore now no condemnation,' said the apostle, 'to them that are in Christ Jesus.' This writer says there is no condemnation to them that are out of Christ Jesus. Whether they recognize it or not, if God does not reckon sin, then He does not reckon sin, and that is the end of it.

'I could enlarge with scriptural evidences, if necessary,' says Mr. Corbet. It does seem necessary. For the only scriptural reference he has given is of doubtful relevancy. 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins have been done away.' It is not a matter of the true reading or translation (both of which are somewhat doubtful here), it is a matter of manifest meaning. Clearly the sins of the man were forgiven, or 'done away' as Mr. Corbet unfairly translates, that very moment, and through the forgiving fiat of the Saviour. If he had not been Saviour, could He have done it? He asked whether was easier to say, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee,' or to say, 'Rise and walk.' Either was easy to Him, neither was possible to any other.

But He uses the word 'son,' says Mr. Corbet. 'For,' he says, 'He is speaking to him as to a child of God, and tells him, without any solicitation on his part, an eternal fact, viz. that his sins have no existence as in the mind or eye of God.' No, they have not, *after they have been forgiven*. And it is in the light of that forgiveness that He calls him son.

For even those who hold by the universal Fatherhood of God rarely go so far as our modern mystic and proclaim the universal sonship of men. In the latest issue of 'The International Theological Library' that matter comes before us. *The Theology of the New Testament* cannot miss a full discussion of the expressions Father and Son. And Professor Stevens is as frank as he is lucid. He believes that the universal Fatherhood of God is taught at least in the synoptics, but he does not find a universal sonship even there.

Professor Stevens is very frank and fair. He says that the prevailing usage of Jesus is to speak of God as the Father of His own disciples. Even in the Sermon on the Mount this is so. 'The discourse is indeed a collection of sayings uttered at various times and places, but it is represented as spoken to the disciples, and there is no critical ground for doubt that at least the earlier portions were so spoken.' He says, besides, that there is no passage in our sources in which Jesus explicitly

speaks of God as the Father of all men. Still he thinks that in the synoptic teaching Jesus expresses the thought of God as one who acts towards all men as a father acts towards his children—if only they would allow Him. But he never finds it taught that all men are His sons. He as Father stands in the right relation and ready; they have first to attain to their relation as sons.

Our 'modern mystic's' view of sin is not new, and it does not press very hard upon us now. There is a sorer battle we have to fight, a battle with a more radical heresy. The 'modern mystic' assures us that sin has been done away by God from all eternity; the modern man of science says there never was any sin to do away.

This is the view of sin that Canon Gore finds it needful to take account of in his exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. For the Bible postulates the existence of sin; it claims that sin everywhere, and from the first, has been a cause of degradation in the individual and the race. Science denies that. The progress of the race, says science, has been upward, not downward; it has been a gradual process of development and advance, and the individual cannot sin, not, as St. John would say, because he is born of God, but simply because he is born. He has no freedom to sin. He is a man, and therefore under the dominion of the laws of development. What seems his individual act is simply the evolutionary law which has him in its grasp, expressing itself through him.

Here, says Canon Gore, is the real point at issue between religion and science. The main question is not about human origins or a primeval fall. It is not, Did all mankind fall in Adam's first transgression? or even, Did Adam fall? The question is, Do men fall now, and can they keep from falling? Is human freedom—freedom within limits to choose and act—a reality? Can man therefore misuse this freedom to do what he need not have done and ought not to have done?

Now it seems to Canon Gore that when the issue is fairly faced science must give way. For 'the universal moral consciousness and common sense of man bears witness to the fact that we can do and do do what we ought and need not.' And not only so, but it also recognizes the moral truth of St. Paul's idea that this lawlessness of the will has its perverting effects on the intelligence and the passions. On the one side, and it is the side of the Bible, we have the human consciousness; on the other, no positive evidence, only the habitual unwillingness of science to recognize its proper limits.

It is no longer understood that the Old Testament religion was dictated to the Old Testament saints and prophets. It is no longer a heresy to say that the Hebrew religion is part of a larger Semitic religion. And it is not even supposed that that takes any glory from the Hebrew religion. If the materials out of which the religion was formed were common to the nations around, the spirit was the possession of the Hebrew only. It is now universally recognized that many of our Lord's sayings were current in His earthly day. But He gave them spirit and life. And originality consists in that.

We are no longer startled, therefore, to read, as we read in the *Contemporary Review* recently, that 'the Yahweh cult of the primitive Hebrews is not to be looked upon as an isolated form of worship, but rather as a religious system which was in its earliest beginnings identical with the very far-spread adoration of the moon-god.' It is true we do not take easily to expressions like 'the Yahweh cult'; and we are jealous lest a form of words like *Lord of Hosts*, which may have served an idolatrous worship once, should be claimed as evidence of an idolatrous worship still. But even when we are reminded that the moon-god was best known in antiquity under the name of Sin, we are not disturbed to hear how close is the correspondence between the worship of Sin and the worship of

Jehovah in their outward expression, so long as the inner secret is the difference between earth and heaven.

Mr. George Margoliouth, of the British Museum, published an article in the *Contemporary Review* recently, in which he sought to show that many of the words of the moon-god worship have been retained in the worship of Jehovah. He has now written a pamphlet of twenty pages (Nutt, 1s.) to strengthen that proposition. He has chosen certain Old Testament expressions, and endeavoured to trace their origin.

The first is the title *Jehovah of Hosts*. Mr. Margoliouth has no doubt that the 'Sabaoth' or 'Hosts' in that title are the stars. That is indeed the nearly unanimous judgment of Old Testament scholars now,—not only of Cheyne, but also of Kuenen, Tiele, Baudissin, and even of Delitzsch. But why is Jehovah called Jehovah of the Stars? Mr. Margoliouth has found the explanation in a Babylonian hymn. There Nannar (as the moon-god was called at Ur of the Chaldees in preference to Sin) is addressed as 'lord of the hosts of heaven,' as the deity 'who was seen to gather around him the glorious hosts of stars on the weird vault of night' (*Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. iv.). The sun-god was not so glorious. He had to cross the heavens unattended, as it appeared, by stars. So, to the moon-god was given this glorious title. And from the moon-god it was transferred to Jehovah. As the God of Israel, He is the Supreme Ruler of the universe, the Lord of the Hosts of Heaven, and of all the powers that animated them.

The second is the phrase *to exalt the horn*. What that phrase means is evident. It means to raise to dignity and power. But what is its origin? Mr. Margoliouth finds its origin in the 'mitre ornamented with horns,' which is the emblem of the god Sin. The deity, says Maspero, who ruled the world from his abode in the lunar orb, was cosmically seen to shoot forth in brightly shining horns during the first quarter of each month; and when the disc was completed, Sin was said to have put on his mitre (*agu*), an expression which then includes the halos which form around the moon. So when Hannah says, 'Mine horn is exalted in Jehovah' (1 S 2^1), she uses the forms of an outworn faith to express her sense of the honour she has received from the God of Israel; and in Jer 48^{25} the defeat of the Moabites is crushingly expressed by saying that their horn is cut off.

But more curious than that (perhaps more doubtful also) is Mr. Margoliouth's explanation of the phrase which in our versions is translated the skin of Moses' face *shone*. Literally, the Hebrew is, the skin of Moses' face was found *to send forth horns*. Moses had been for many days in close communication with Jehovah on Mount Sinai. What more natural than that his face should take on the reflexion of the God with whom he had been in converse? That reflexion still preserves enough of the old imagery to have it described as *shining horns*. And the imagery would the more readily come to hand that Mount Sinai was originally the dwelling-place of the god Sin.

Last November the Directors of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, met to inaugurate the Rev. William Adams Brown, M.A., as Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology. The charge was delivered by Dr. C. H. Parkhurst. Professor Adams Brown then delivered an inaugural address on 'Christ the Vitalizing Principle of Christian Theology.' The man had been carefully chosen for the Chair—a Chair once occupied by Dr. Henry B. Smith and by Dr. W. G. T. Shedd—and he had as carefully chosen his subject. The proceedings on the occasion have since then been published by the Martin Publishing House of New York, and we can read the address in full.

We are all familiar with the theological achievement of our time which expresses itself in the rallying cry, 'Back to Christ!' There was danger,

though perhaps the danger was not so great as some represented it, that we should lose touch with the beating heart of our faith in speculations and wranglings over matters that belonged only to the head. So the forces of true religion were rallied under that cry, and the rally was successful. We are back to Christ. Christ is once more the centre of our religious thought, and even of our theological speculation. We are conscious that we have not only received Christ again into the heart, but that we have received a Christo-centric theology.

The gain is unmistakable and very great. It has seized the systematic theologian and shaken him in his Chair. At first it seemed likely to shake him out of his Chair, that the biblical theologian might sit in it. But that danger passed. Biblical theology has come to stay, but systematic theology is needed also. Only, the systematic theologian must no longer be content to hand down from generation to generation the doctrinal system which has been inherited from the past; he must no longer be content to explain and defend the creeds and dogmas of the historic Church; or to mark off with the sharp precision of a rigorous logic the narrow path, by following which alone men may hope to escape the pitfalls of heterodoxy on the right hand and on the left. He must see to it that the creed he teaches is a living conviction in his own soul. He must so teach it that in the hearts and consciences of men it will waken a response which will be the best evidence of its truth and its unfaltering argument against opposition. He must cease to regard it as a law-regulating belief, as the Scribes were used to do; he must make it a Confession of Faith, and teach with authority as the Master did.

That is the new conception of systematic theology. It is a revolution. And the cry of 'Back to Christ!' has done it. For the moment that Christ was placed in the creed, the creed was found to be spirit and life. It was not taken on from without; the materials only were received by tradition; the creed was woven from within, a personal conviction, the record of a personal experience. The new conception of systematic theology is that theology is personal experience or it is nothing. The biologist may teach the Darwinian theory, whether he is a Darwinian or not. The politician may write imperialist articles all the while he is a 'Little Englander.' But the systematic theologian dare no longer sit in his Chair unless he is able to touch the universal Christian experience by the vital spark of his own.

But if that is the new conception of systematic theology, does it not run into two great dangers? Does it not run the risk of being very narrow in range and very subjective in character? It runs both risks. And proves its life by the risks it runs. But it is the business of the systematic theologian to see that it only runs these risks and does not fall into them.

It runs the risk of being too narrow. But the systematic theologian is careful to see that his own personal experience is not the contents of his teaching, but only its vital energy. The contents of his teaching is experience certainly. For outside experience there is no truth with which we have to do. But it is the experience of the whole Church of God in all the ages. And by the Church of God, Professor Adams Brown does not mean the Christian Church of these nineteen centuries and that alone.

It runs the risk also of being too subjective. But the systematic theologian avoids that risk by seeing that every experience is a revelation of reality, and is in contact with objective facts. The Christian experience is not independent of the historic Christian institutions. It is not independent of the Scriptures with their present revelation of Christ, of the Church with her creeds, her ministry, and her sacraments. When we speak of Christian experience we include these. They are the facts by which the experience is created and by which it is maintained. Without them it had

never come into being, without them it would soon cease to be. The theologian avoids the risk of subjectivity by never losing sight of historic fact.

But in truth the risk, whether of subjectivity or of narrowness, is far less now than it used to be. Take away from the historic doctrines that living experience of which they are the outgrowth, make them mere dogmas, lifeless forms, relics of an age long past and of an outgrown type of thought, and then the spirit of man will seek its expression elsewhere. Then each man will be an experience to himself and a mystic to others. But make your systematic theologian an interpreter; let him unfold to the men of the present the meaning of the past; let him show them that the Christian doctrines, even in their most scholastic form, are the outgrowth of a living experience and witness to eternal verities; and then the human soul will take these materials and fuse them in the crucible of its own living experience, bringing forth things that are new undoubtedly, but that are in vital harmony with the universal experience and with universal spiritual facts.

Life after Death.

By the Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester.

'Shall the dust praise Thee?'—Ps. xxx. 9.

These sad and even bitter words from one of the sweet singers of Israel show to us, with almost terrible force, how deep were the shadows which rested on the saint of the old Covenant when the end of our mortality, and the fear that end carried with it, pressed heavily on the soul. And that fear, that outcome and heritage of sin, lingers now, even though Christ has brought life and incorruption to light, and has abolished death for ever. That it is so, all experience seems sadly to confirm. That there is a dread of death in the background of almost every heart, arising commonly from some doubts as to the reality of a continued existence, is a serious truth, which no sober observer of human nature would feel disposed to deny. That it exists in Christian hearts, even though the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews solemnly declares that the dear Lord passed through death that He might deliver all who were under the bondage of this fear—that it so exists, who of us who looks into the depths of his own soul could consistently doubt?

On such a subject, then, it may not be unprofitable to meditate, more especially as within the last few years several works, some of real importance, have been written on the subject of life after death and the questions connected with it. Most of them appear to deal with the subject independently of Holy Scripture, and to review the arguments—some of them reaching back to remote antiquity — for the continuance of a personal existence after its earthly termination. These arguments no reasonable man can regard with indifference. Some of them are of real use in confronting the inferences of materialism drawn from the ultimate return of the body to the elements of which it was originally formed: 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.' Others appeal, often very successfully, to inner convictions of a continuance of a personal existence which seem to be a very part of our sentient selves. Further, it may be added, that Science itself, which has so often been regarded as in antagonism to Faith, has contributed some considerations in favour of our survival after death which have been found to exercise an influence over minds to which no other form of argument has seemed, even transiently, to appeal. It is impossible, then, to regard with indifference these non-scriptural arguments for continuity of existence, but, at the same time, it seems perfectly clear that none of them, nor all of them combined, can do more than make survival after death a reasonable probability. It is Scripture, and Scripture only, that can convert that probability into certainty. It is only through the gospel brought home to the heart of the humble,

hoping, but as yet incompletely convinced, seeker after truth, that the holy mystery of immortality can be fully realized and believed in with that unwavering conviction which faith absolutely demands.

Still it may not be unprofitable briefly to review the non-scriptural arguments for man's unending existence that appear to have made the deepest impression on the human mind, as they may, in many cases, just exercise that prevenient and preparatory influence which may make the reception of the fulness of scriptural truth more easy and more permanent. Of these arguments there are three that certainly deserve our consideration—the argument from the nature and constitution of all things around us or, as it is commonly entitled, the constitution of the universe; the argument from moral considerations; and the argument from the general consent of mankind.

The three arguments when taken together do plainly create in any fair judging mind a strong presumption that our existence does not terminate with bodily death; but they suggest but little as to the nature of the continued existence. The first argument, for instance, from the constitution of things around us, does seem very powerfully to bring home to us that, where the universal principle is conservation, and continuity through transformation and change, man and man's nature cannot possibly be exempted from its operation. What reason can there be for thinking that the principle breaks down and becomes inoperative in the case of things endowed with life? If it does not break down, this question certainly has to be answered: Whenever death puts a stop to bodily activities and works great changes in the fabric in which the bodily activities were exerted and manifested, what has become of that to which these activities were due? If there is to be conservation everywhere, though confessedly with change, then surely, that which acted, call it by what name you like, must be somewhere, and survive, though obviously under changed conditions. Annihilated it cannot be, such a conception being fundamentally opposed to everything that is observable in the nature and constitution of things. This argument is of real importance and power in confronting the assertion of materialism that when man dies he perishes. It is, however, of but limited value in regard of the question of what that is which survives. It certainly predisposes us to accept the all but universally prevalent belief that man consists of two parts, the material, to which we give the name of the body, and the immaterial, to which we give, somewhat loosely, the name of the soul. It helps us, then, to identify the something that survives with the soul, but on its after existence it throws no light whatever. That light must be sought for elsewhere.

Very much the same may be said of the second of the three arguments to which I have alluded. This second argument for existence after death is founded on moral considerations which are felt by many to be of great force and cogency. What, for example, can be more perplexing to every thoughtful mind than undeserved suffering, or successful wickedness, or the countless enigmas in poor mortal life, which seem almost incompatible with any real belief in an overruling Providence, and, in many and many cases, make men doubt the existence of any moral governor of the world? Do not these things all force upon the mind the conviction that there must be an after-life, in which right and wrong will ultimately be dealt with, and the stern law of consequences be fully carried out in all the issues and developments of the future?

This argument, like the first, though founded on very different considerations, is an argument for a survival after death which no serious and reasonable man could lightly set aside; but except indirectly and allusively, it throws no light on the after-existence of that which survives—that immaterial part of our nature which we have agreed to speak of as the soul. It does, however, by the very nature of its argument, imply that in the after-existence the great principle of moral retribution will certainly prevail. Of the state of the soul and the nature of its existence, we are, so far as this argument is conerned, as ignorant as ever.

There is, I said, a third argument for a life after death, which certainly cannot be left unnoticed. It is, however, very different in its nature from the two we have already considered. It is in effect this—that if we deny an existence after death, we place ourselves in opposition to what may be correctly spoken of as the conviction or persuasion of the whole human family. It was once considered that races were in existence in which no trace of any conception of existence after death could possibly be found. But I believe I am correct in saying that recent investigation has tended to show, that dim and imperfectly realized

as the conception of an after-existence may be in some of the lowest races of mankind, none can now be correctly described as absolutely devoid of it. This third argument is thus an argument that is considered by many to be the greatest and most persuasive of all. But great and persuasive as it may be, it supplies us with nothing that throws a real light on the state of existence after death. Apart from Christianity, every race has its different conception of the after-life, some of these conceptions presenting aspects of a higher and more spiritual character, but the greater part mere continuity under more favourable circumstances than those which were met with during earthly existence.

We have now reviewed these non-scriptural arguments for a future life, and they are probably the best that the mind of man has yet been able to put forth. But what light have they cast upon the myterious future of human existence? They have made it probable, even highly probable, that there will be an after-life, but have they supplied any solid grounds for the belief that this after-life would be life indeed? Could the really earnest and anxious soul be satisfied with the mere assurance of survival after death? Nay more, could it rest even on such a future as is disclosed to us by the Old Testament? What opportunities does the Old Testament future indicate for a life, after death, of service to Him who called us into being? What realms does it point to in which there will be the power of exercising, for the honour and glory of God, all those faculties that we are conscious, even in this poor earthly life, are the highest and noblest elements in our composite nature? These and a thousand similar questions are called up in every devoted heart when the subject of existence after death is occupying the foreground of our meditations. We soon find, if we have any spark of true religion in the soul, that all our spiritual interest is in that of which the arguments we have reviewed tell us absolutely nothing. They may show that it is probable that there will be a life after death, but on the real and essential nature of that life, its intrinsic character, that which alone makes it worth living, they give no indication whatever. These mysteries can only be disclosed by Revelation, and it is to Revelation, and especially to Him who has brought life and incorruption to light, that we reverently and finally turn. He it is who alone can give to the anxious soul the answers which it is seeking to obtain. And the answers are these, that man does verily live after death; and that, to every loving and believing heart, the nature of that life after death *is life with Him*. On Him and our relations with Him the whole mystery of our future absolutely depends.

In practice we do not sufficiently realize this relation to the Person of the Risen Lord. When shadows fall around us, and anxious questions arise (and they will arise in the very best of us) as to a real continuity of existence after the grave has received its dead, we commonly fall back on persuasions which seem to cling to our humanity, that all things cannot and will not end here; or to a general feeling that, as Scripture stands pledged to the teaching of a life after death, we may rest upon its testimony, and dismiss our anxieties as to our future.

But, as all experience shows, when the dread of death is resting on the soul, we need something far more reassuring than persuasions and arguments. What we need is heart-whole belief not in reasonings, but in a blessed and adorable Person, who has verily abolished death, and is Himself so eternally the Resurrection and the Life, that whosoever liveth and believeth in Him shall never, never die. This is what we need, and what we must pray for. The whole mystery of the life after death, our anxieties, our hopes, and our reassurances, are all centred in Him. In Him is life, and the life is the light of man here and hereafter. Assuredly the lesson which our present thoughts bring home to us is this—that until we not only believe in Christ, but can truly feel that we are in Him and He in us, the fear of death will still linger in the soul.

Our meditations here may close. They have led us to Christ, and have shown us that in Him and with Him no dread of death, no anxiety as to a future existence can ever find a place in our spiritual life. Our beloved Elder Brother will never forsake us; He tasted death that He might sustain the parting spirit as it enters into the unknown realm of the waiting world of the departed. He passed through those realms, and vouchsafed to know the mystery of the unclothed state that He might comfort us while thus waiting in that mystic world for His blessed and long-promised return. Yea, and when the clouds at length bear Him down to this poor earth, His voice will call us forth; we shall be robed with the body like unto His glorious body, and at last realize—Immortality.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Muhammed's Doctrine of Revelation.[1]

Had this important and learned work been concerned with Christianity and its Author instead of with Islam and its Prophet, it would have been fitly characterized as a contribution to Biblical Theology. Its object is to investigate the meaning, manner, and essential content of Revelation, as the idea presented itself to the mind of Muhammed himself, and lies at the basis of the claims of the Korân. It is the work of a scholar and enthusiast. At first sight it might be calculated to damp the ardour of those who, however familiar with German, are unacquainted with Arabic; its pages bristle with quotations from the original. The publishers, however, with a wise prudence, attach to the title-page a conspicuous notice calling attention to the fact that all such quotations are accompanied by German renderings, so that the book is quite intelligible to the ordinary reader.

The four chapters of which the work consists, and each of which is divided into three sections, are respectively entitled—Muhammed's Prophetic Consciousness, The Nature of Revelation, The Content of Revelation, and The Media of Revelation. The author begins by emphasizing the importance of his subject, since Muhammed, though classed by many eminent scholars as a false prophet, a deceiver, and one possessed of a devil, is reverenced as a Messenger of God by no less than 200 millions, or about a seventh part, of the inhabitants of the earth. He believes that Muhammed truly felt himself to be the instrument of a Higher Power, that as really as any prophet of Israel he could say, 'The Lord hath spoken; who can but prophesy?' and regards him as essentially unselfish and disinterested, though in many things the child of his age and country. It was in being called to grapple with the evils of his time that the Arabian prophet came to perceive whither his destiny led him. At first he was doubtful as to the Divine origin of the visions which came to him; he feared lest he should be self-deceived; but at length yielded himself to the force which, through the impulses of his heart as well as the experiences of his life, urged him forward. Dr. Pautz admits that Muhammed was of an excessively nervous temperament, and was subject to peculiar attacks of illness, but denies that the symptoms are those of epilepsy, as is often asserted. But his visions of angels and other supernatural experiences were doubtless commonly attended by morbid physical conditions. The need of revelation, in the Muhammedan as in other religions, is derived chiefly from the fact of Sin, and the Hebrew account of primeval mankind is generally adopted, though it is denied that the doctrine of original sin is to be found in the Korân. Muhammed indeed, like other great religious reformers, acknowledges the work of his predecessors while claiming to complete it. His testimony to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures is singularly ample, and is capable of being cited with great force as an inducement to Muhammedans to study the latter.[2] As St. Paul appeals to the Promise made to Abraham as antecedent to the law, so Muhammed seems to aim at restoring Abraham's religion, which was prior to both Law and Gospel.

One of the most interesting sections of the work before us is that in which the Prophet's attitude to Heathenism and to Christian doctrines is described. Like Abraham, his soul was stirred by the idolatry which he beheld around him, and, curiously enough, orthodox Christianity was, in his view, invested with the same character, the doctrine of the Trinity being interpreted in a Tritheistic sense, the Persons being Allah, Jesus, and Mary—a Holy Family after a very human type. The words of Christ as to the Paraclete or Comforter are interpreted by Muhammed of himself, and the influence of heretical forms of Christianity is apparent in his view that Jesus did not really die upon the cross. The two great doctrines of Muhammedanism, on the other hand, are its abstract Monotheism, and its peculiar eschat-

[1] *Muhammeds Lehre von der Offenbarung quellenmässig untersucht.* Von Dr. Otto Pautz. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898. M. 8.

[2] See a little book, *Moslems invited to read the Bible*, by Principal Sir Wm. Muir (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899).

ology. In regard to the latter, Dr. Pautz pronounces it impossible to determine whether, in his sensuous pictures of the life beyond the grave, Muhammed meant to symbolize a more spiritual conception of bliss, or was simply pandering to the baser impulses of human nature. In its details his doctrine had little that was original, but upon them Muhammed so impressed his individuality that he is justly reckoned as the founder of a new religion. His teaching in its simplicity and intelligibility was eminently suited to those whom he addressed, and our author contrasts somewhat sadly the religious enthusiasm of Muhammedans with that of Christians. He also claims that in the mass Muhammedans are more moral as well as more religious than Christians, notwithstanding the great blot of polygamy, which, however, only affects the highest classes. But as religions, in respect of their ideals and principles, he fully recognizes the gulf between the two. Muhammed's is a kingdom of this world, Christ's a kingdom of heaven. Muhammed was ever the despot, Christ came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Though (p. 189) it is stated, contrary to the prevailing view, that Muhammed ever desired and sought to avoid the appeal to the sword, yet this was forced upon him, as he recognized that the spread of the faith meant war against the unbelievers, and especially against idolators. There was a sense doubtless in which Christ also came not to send peace but a sword, but the war here was the inevitable conflict of right and wrong, and not the application of outward means to bring about moral ends. Where Christ taught the duty of love even towards enemies, Muhammed consecrated the *lex talionis*, and constantly preached revenge. And most striking of all, doubtless, is Christ's inculcation of purity and His spiritual conception of the future life in contrast with Muhammed's eternity of lust, if, as we have said, the literal interpretation of this doctrine, which has been that all but universally accepted by his followers, is not a mistaken one. And yet our author concludes—though his judgment in this is diametrically opposed to that of Sir William Muir, whom he accuses of the usual 'Englischer Partikularismus'—that Islâm has been an enormous blessing to the savage heathen populations which it has reached, in the deeper thought of God, the awakening and cultivation of the religious life, the elevation of morals, the industrial and commercial pursuits, and the progressive civilization it has introduced among them. He trusts that it will be found a true stepping-stone to the higher faith, and that as in the providence of God it has doubtless its own place to fill, so those who inscribe upon their banners '*Islâm*,' that is, 'surrender to God,' will, in the day when there shall be one flock and one Shepherd, be found not unworthy to enter the kingdom of heaven.

This is a work which will reward patient study, and which combines in a remarkable degree the enthusiasm of the expert with the caution of the sound and sagacious critic. We have only to add that it is accompanied by a glossary of transliterated Arabic words, and by an index to the passages cited from the Korân and from the Old and New Testaments.

ALEXANDER STEWART.

St. Andrews.

The Origins of the Christian Life.[1]

DR. MÜLLER has undertaken a great subject. All alike, believers or non-believers, are agreed that if our relation to Christ and His religion to-day is to correspond to the truth of things, it is of the first importance to understand Christ as He was on earth, and His religion as He taught it and His disciples believed and lived it. Dr. Müller is moreover right in pointing out this as the very problem which all our scientific investigation of Christian origins has so far left unsolved. Once again, Dr. Müller, in this first part of an unfinished work, appears to be leading us to a true conclusion, namely, that any explanation of Christ's personality and religion by merely historical and finite causes is doomed to failure, that Christianity in its original form was a phenomenon which postulates, on inductive grounds, a supernatural causality.

The writer's method, lastly, is in its idea rightly chosen—Not the *tenets* of the early Christians, but the *experience* which underlies those tenets, is the centre of the problem. We are dealing not with opinion but with Life; and the question which is at the back of every other question of New Testament history and interpretation is, What type of personal religion is here revealed to view?

[1] *Das persönliche Christenthum der Paulinischen Gemeinden nach seiner Entstehung untersucht.* Erster Teil. By Dr. Johannes Müller. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898. 306 pp. Price M.6.

To reconstruct the consciousness of Jesus Himself is, as Dr. Müller says, beyond our power; *τίς ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου*; but we can study it 'in a mirror' in so far as we can reproduce the personal religion of the apostolic Churches. And as a matter of fact the only insight we can gain into the spiritual process which was at work in the apostolic Churches is through the Epistles of St. Paul. Their extent, their close address to the spiritual state of the Churches, their wealth of detail, justify and indeed compel their selection as the main source of evidence.

So far as I can follow Dr. Müller's treatment, he aims at tracing the 'life-history' of a Christian of St. Paul's making; he emphasizes the presence of a new factor in life, and the constantly asserted consciousness that this new life has a supernatural cause. And he maintains that the only genuinely inductive method constrains him to recognize that this consciousness is founded upon real fact.

The attempt to explain not merely tenets, but the experience that lies behind them, carries us out of our nineteenth-century philosophical limits; and on purely scientific grounds we are compelled to assert the existence of a cause unknown to science. The case is not precisely on all-fours with that of miracle. There, science can go as far as the author of *Ecce Homo* and recognize the fact of certain inexplicable occurrences and their attribution by those who saw them to supernatural agency. But science cannot say 'this is a miracle' in the religious sense of the word. Science and miracle are incommensurate. We cannot reproduce the original experience of external miracle. But we can reproduce the original experience of the Christian life as St. Paul's disciples lived it—indeed, our power of understanding it depends on the extent to which we can reproduce it in our own experience; and so to reproduce it is to be conscious that it is the effect of no merely 'finite' cause. To stop short at such causes is, says Dr. Müller, 'mere timid reluctance to look over into the unfathomed depths, while yet we can feel the inductive ground solid under foot.'

This is the main idea and purpose of the book. It is worked out at great, in fact excessive length, and one trembles at the thought of a further volume or volumes to follow. For able as the work is and full of ideas, it is—if a foreigner may venture to pronounce upon a question of German style—perfectly unreadable. This opinion might be modified were it possible to be alone with the book for a week or so on a desert island, and read and re-read until every part was clear. But few of us have a desert island available; and to those who have not, the present work will soon bring satiety.

To make the book as effective as its substantial value deserves, it should be rewritten in a more concise and literary form. The revival of pellucid style in much recent German theology, a phenomenon strongly marked in the writings of such men as Harnack, has spoiled us for laboured compositions like this.

A. Robertson.

King's College.

Among the Periodicals.

Blass' Hypothesis of Two Editions of the Acts.

By this time most readers of The Expository Times are familiar with Blass' hypothesis that two editions of the Acts have come down to us, both emanating from St. Luke himself, and that the older of these, supposed to have been issued at Rome, is to be sought especially in Codex D and the Old Latin versions. The hypothesis has found wide acceptance both in our own country and on the Continent, being championed, for instance, by Th. Zahn in the recently issued second volume of his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* On the other hand, Professor Harnack subjects it to a very adverse criticism in the *Sitzungsberichte d. königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (Philos-histor. Classe) of 2nd March last. Without traversing the whole field, Harnack concentrates attention upon the so-called Apostolic decree of Ac 15^{29} in its bearing upon the Blassian hypothesis. His aim is to show that in this crucial instance the supposed *textus prior* is the work of a corrector. Harnack's process of argument is as follows.

It appears to be proved that certain precepts and prohibitions contained in chaps. i. ff. of the *Didache* really rest upon a 'Catechism,' which influences also the *Apology of Aristides* (xv. 4 ff.), the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili* (xxi.), the language of Theophilus (*ad Autol.* ii. 34), etc. This Catechism was probably of Jewish origin, but in any case it was quite independent of any N.T.

book. The 'golden rule' was interposed between the injunction to love God and one's neighbour, and a catalogue of sins to be avoided, and the whole appears to have closed with a special warning against 'things offered to idols.' Now, when we turn to the decree of Ac 15^{29}, all uncial MSS except D read ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ πνικτῶν καὶ πορνείας. ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε. Ἔρρωσθε. The decree has thus the abstention from εἰδωλόθυτα and πορνεία in common with the Catechism; but the whole arrangement is such as to show that it is independent of the latter, and in particular the prohibition of 'blood' must refer to eating of blood and not to bloodshed. But now when we turn to the Western authorities, we find (1) the omission of καὶ πνικτῶν; (2) the insertion after πορνείας of the 'golden rule'; (3) the expansion of the closing salutation into φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ἔρρωσθε.

Harnack sets himself first to refute the arguments of Zahn against the unity of the Western text in its present form. And now which is the original, the Western or the Eastern text? Till lately, this question could hardly have arisen, but it needs now to be faced, in view, for instance, of the way in which Hilgenfeld contends for the priority of the Western. Harnack, on the contrary, argues: (1) the Eastern text presents a perfectly harmonious picture, dealing practically with only two questions, the one connected with eating, the other with πορνεία. The Western text, on the other hand, in whatever sense αἷμα be understood, lacks harmony. If αἷμα be taken to refer to the eating of blood, how unfitting that it should be followed by the 'golden rule'! Whereas, if it be taken, as the Westerns took it, as = 'bloodshed,' then the introduction of εἰδωλόθυτα betrays the secondary character of the text. (2) The 'golden rule' is in point of form awkwardly introduced in D. Although in Ac 15^{20} the Gentile Christians are spoken of in the third person, the rule is given in the second (καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἑτέροις μὴ ποιεῖτε). Again, the absence of the rule in Ac 21^{25} is not favourable to the originality of the Western text. Finally, the words with which even the Western text closes, ἀφ' ὧν διατηροῦντες, etc., are no longer suitable, after the insertion of the 'golden rule.' (3) It is inexplicable how the Eastern could have originated from the Western text. The addition of the 'golden rule' is surely far more intelligible than its omission. Moreover, the transformation of ceremonial statutes such as we have in the Eastern text, into moral principles has abundant analogies, whereas the converse is without any historical parallel. (4) It is certain that in the earliest Christian times not only was there a prohibition in force against εἰδωλόθυτα and πορνεία, but it was also the practice to abstain from blood and from things strangled. This is witnessed to even by Tertullian (*Apol.* ix.), although καὶ πνικτῶν was wanting in his text of the Apostolic decree (*de Pudic.* xii.), and although he refers the αἷμα of the latter 'multo magis' to bloodshed. The prevalence of such a custom, *even in the West, where the alleged corrected text gained no footing*, makes it impossible to seek for its explanation in a secondary correction of the Acts instead of in the actual issue, at an early date, of such a decree. Questions indeed remain as to when, under what circumstances, and for what circles the decree was issued, but there can be no question that that recension of the Acts which contains it has a higher claim to priority than the recension which contains a purely moral catechism. (5) But for Galatians and other Pauline Epistles, probably no exception would have been taken to the genuineness of the Apostolic decree as given in the Eastern text, for it might fairly be argued that its terms suit well the historical situation. It is different with the Western text. The controversy about the abiding validity of the Mosaic law and the relation of Christians to it ended, then, in the drawing up of an elementary moral catechism, warning Gentile Christians against gross sins and against injury to one's neighbour!

On all these grounds Harnack concludes with certainty that the Eastern text is the original, and the Western a later correction of it.

Harnack proceeds next to consider the genuineness of the decree as contained in the *Eastern* text. In spite of the arguments of Zahn (*Kanongesch.* ii. 431 ff.) he still finds it impossible to reconcile Ac 15 with Gal $2^{1\text{-}10}$. He therefore rejects the decree as one actually passed by the Apostolic Council, but has no doubt of its historicity. It had a special occasion, although what this was must remain unknown to us, nor can we tell how far it was effective as a compromise in meeting the views of Jewish Christians. It was not in existence when 1 Co was written; on the other hand, it is inconceivable that it should have taken its rise after the destruction of Jerusalem. Harnack

makes the very interesting suggestion that the words of Ac 21^{25}, 'As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written,' etc., are not an echo of 15^{29}, but bear the same relation to it as $22^{3\text{-}16}$ (the account of St. Paul's conversion) bears to chap. 9. That is to say, an epistolary edict to the effect contained in 21^{25} may have gone forth from Jerusalem shortly before St. Paul's visit to the capital, and St Luke may have mistakenly transferred this to the Apostolic Council and given to it the wording we find in Ac 15.

The history of the fortunes which the decree experienced in the Church appears to Harnack to be little favourable to the title it bears in St. Luke: *τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων* (16^{4}). This history is much more intelligible if we have to do with what was originally a concession on the part of the Jerusalem elders (cf. on Ac 21^{25} above). The undoubted fact that the decree, within a few decades of its publication as apostolic in Acts, was superseded in this same book by another form, is unique in the earliest Church history, and sheds a peculiar light on the 'apostolicity' of the decree. Harnack seeks to reconstruct the course which the history actually followed. At the Apostolic Council the mission of St. Paul to the uncircumcision, and the claim of the Gentile believers to be recognized as Christians, although they did not conform to the Law, were admitted, but a common *modus vivendi* for the two factors in the Church was not yet sought to be established. The only condition accepted by St. Paul was *μνημονεύειν τῶν πτωχῶν* (Gal 2^{10}). Next in order of time probably came the edict of the Jerusalem elders above referred to, which may have furnished a solution of the difficulty in districts where the Jewish element had to be taken into account, but as it emanated simply from Jerusalem and not from the apostles, it was treated with more or less freedom. The arbitrary nature of the contents of the decree, with its four prohibitions, was not favourable to its permanent validity. Hence in Rev 2^{20} there is mention only of *πορνεῦσαι καὶ φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα*, and none of 'blood and things strangled,' although it is probable that the author was acquainted with the Jerusalem decree and took his stand upon it. But not long before the publication of the Apocalypse, the decree had assumed new importance through St. Luke's attributing it to the Apostolic Council, and in the East it remained essentially in force. It was otherwise in the West, where in place of the antiquated decree contained in the Eastern text a corrector introduced into Acts 15 what is practically a summary of that moral Catechism referred to by Harnack at the outset, which the corrector found treated in the *Didache* as Apostolic. For a variety of reasons Harnack would assign this correction to the first decade of the second century.

The Western text, then, Harnack concludes, is not the first edition of the Acts of the Apostles, it is the work of a Western (likely enough a Roman) corrector, who accomplished his task from twenty to fifty years after the appearance of the book. As to the character of this text, Harnack agrees with the ironical remark of Professor Ramsay, whose views he frequently cites with approval in the course of his investigation, that 'the general impression that almost everyone will derive from reading the Western text, as reconstituted by Dr. Blass, is a feeling of profound thankfulness, in the interest of good literature, that Luke wrote another text of Acts, and did not content himself with this (supposed) first draft.'

In another issue of the *Sitzungsberichte* (6th April) Harnack subjects to a similarly detailed examination the Western text of Ac $11^{27\text{-}28}$ which has been used with such confidence in support of Blass' hypothesis. The conclusion our author reaches (unfortunately we have not space to reproduce his arguments) is again adverse to the priority of D and its allies, and in particular the 'we' of v.^{28} is pronounced to be a foundation of sand upon which to build any theory of the origin of the Acts of the Apostles.

Plummer's 'St. Luke.'

In the *Revue Biblique* of April last there is an appreciative notice of this commentary and of the series to which its belongs. The success of 'The International Critical Commentary' is declared to be more and more pronounced as time goes on. 'It may be confidently affirmed that Plummer's *St. Luke* is the best commentary that has appeared amongst Protestants. The volume, which is marked by the elegance which constitutes the charm of the whole series, displays abundant erudition, which does not, however, overwhelm the reader, whose assimilation of the contents of the commentary is facilitated by the typographical

arrangements.' By the way, we should like to take this opportunity of recommending very warmly the *Revue Biblique* itself, which we believe is not nearly so well known in this country, even among scholars, as it ought to be. It appears quarterly (Paris: V. Lecoffre; London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate), and unquestionably occupies the very first rank as a theological magazine.

An Important German Periodical.

We have received the December number of the *Zeitschrift für Theologie u. Kirche*, published by J. C. B. Mohr (Freiburg i. B.), who some little time ago started the very useful *Theologische Rundschau*. This periodical appears bi-monthly, and costs six shillings per annum. The present number of the *Zeitschrift*, which in size and appearance closely resembles the *Rundschau*, is entirely taken up with an elaborate article by Pfarrer Foerster, bearing the title 'Das Christenthum der Zeitgenossen,' in which the present position of Christianity and its influence in the ecclesiastical and political spheres, as well as in the realm of *belles lettres*, are minutely appreciated.

Notabilia.

The following articles, at some of which we hope to look more closely on some future occasion, may be meanwhile noted:—

'Der jehovistische Bericht über den Bundeschluss am Sinai,' by Steuernagel in *Stud. u. Kritik.*, Heft iii. 1889; 'Zur Geschichte der Tempelmusik und der Tempelpsalmen,' by Büchler, in *ZATW*, Heft i. 1899; 'Die Quellenfrage in der Apostelgeschichte,' by W. Heitmüller, in *Theol. Rundschau*, February–April 1899; 'Les prêtres et les lévites dans le livre d'Ezéchiel,' by van Hoonacker, in *Revue Biblique*, April 1899. We hope to notice soon the same author's important work recently published, *Le sacerdoce lévitique dans la loi et dans l'histoire* (Williams & Norgate, price 8s. 6d.).

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Point and Illustration.

More Things are wrought by Prayer.

Epistle to the Romans.

It was a remark of General Gordon's that it makes a great difference in our feeling towards a stranger if, before we meet him, we have prayed for him. And we may with equal truth say that it makes a great difference in the feelings of others towards us if they have reason to believe that we have prayed for them. St. Paul, therefore, gives himself this advantage. He says, 'God is my witness, whom I worship in my spirit in the gospel of His Son, how unceasingly I make mention of you always in my prayers.' Then he goes on to tell them that he not only prays for their welfare, but prays that he may have the advantage of seeing them face to face and knowing them. And here he puts his desire to see them on the true ground. He wants to visit them because he has something of the utmost value to give them—that he may 'impart to them some spiritual gift.'—C. Gore.

Sleep.

Letters from a Mystic.

Would that you could sleep for a week, for He giveth His beloved 'during' sleep—so says a good rendering of that verse in the Psalms. And remember that the two pillars of earthly existence are hope and sleep. We are lost sheep without these two, estranged from God and irresponsive to our fellow-creatures.—R. W. Corbet.

Ritual.

Letters from a Mystic.

I am perfectly able to enjoy ritualism and æsthetic development of religious ceremony for the purpose of stirring emotion or 'amusement.' I value that word, so common among religious people abroad; the exclamation on your return from a Function is often, 'I hope *Monsieur s'est bien amusé*.' But directly the histrionic or æsthetic is spoken of as giving honour to God in any other respect than as edifying or 'amusing' His children, then I think the border-line of Truth has been transgressed. The true and highest ritual of Christian life is, as St. James says, 'to *visit the fatherless and widows* in their affliction, and to *make no alliance* with the world.'—R. W. Corbet.

The Doom of Life.

The Ascent through Christ.

In the Parable of Lazarus and Dives there is an apparently clear reference to death as a dividing line, in some sense or other, between the periods of opportunity and retribution. The Rich man earnestly desires to return to earth that he may warn his brethren of the terrible punishment of sin in the life to come, and the Poor man is represented as having been taken at once into the bosom of Abraham. But there is no hint given to us that the parable is meant to affirm this to be true of all men.

Every parable must be interpreted in accordance with the central motive which governs it. In this case the truth to be emphasized is quite other than the finality of death as regards human probation. It is a far more terrible doctrine than that. The parable teaches us that *long before death* the final doom of some people may be already settled. They have arrived at that state in which no further revelation of the will of God and of the solemnity of life's choices, even though these be emphasized by the rising of a near relative from the dead by way of warning, would be of any avail. *These five brothers of Dives had already passed the crisis of moral choice.* In face of the full and sufficient light granted to them they had rejected the better part. The Divine resources of appeal had in their case been exhausted; not death had settled their doom but life; the only function of death in their case would be to unfold their hidden condition, and bring the retributive process to a head.—E. Griffith-Jones.

Some Critical Difficulties in the Chapters on Balaam.

By Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Oxford.

Most rash would be the person who should venture to say that nothing more could be got from the fascinating group of narratives and poems relative to the seer Balaam. Dillmann's commentary is painstaking in the extreme, but often leaves one unsatisfied; he is a noble specimen of an already almost ancient school of criticism. It is the condition upon which we work that we leave something for our successors to accomplish. Professor D. H. Müller has done admirably; he has recovered a reference to the kingdom of Sham'al in N.-W. Syria in Nu $24^{23.24}$ (see *Expositor* [1896] iii. 77–80), which is now so well known to us through the discoveries at the Tell of Zinjirli, unless, indeed, anyone should prefer the ingenious conjectures of Professor Hommel (*Anc. Heb. Trad.* 245 f.). But it seems to be open to us to improve the text of vv.$^{23.24}$ still further in connexion with the text of v.^{22}. Premising that 𝔊 here gives worse than no help, as could easily be shown, I would propose to read vv.$^{22-24}$ thus, omitting the introduction of v.^{23}:—

22 כִּי אִם־יִהְיֶה לְבָעַר קָיִן	But Ḳain shall be given to destruction,
אֱדוֹם יְרוּשַׁשׁ מוֹשָׁבוֹ	Edom shall beat in pieces his dwelling.
23 אוֹי מִי יִחְיֶה מִשָּׂמְאָל	Alas! who will survive of Sham'al,
24 וְיָצָא מֵעִיר חֲמָת	Or come forth from the city of Hamath?
וְעָרָה אַשּׁוּר אַרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ	Asshur shall lay bare its palaces,
וְהִשְׁמּוּ עָרֵי אַרְפָּד	And they shall waste the cities of Arpad.

This restoration is not quite as certain as some of those which can be produced for difficult poetic passages. It is, however, much more defensible, as I think, than Professor Hommel's; it is at anyrate an attempt to get nearer to the truth which eludes us in the Massoretic text (M.T.). Balaam and his poems (*mĕshālīm* as they were called) are fascinating, as I have ventured to call them, and with a due combination of boldness and caution we may come to understand them a little better. We may be quite certain that 'ships from Chittim' (Cyprus, which was tributary to Sargon) were not represented as able to 'afflict Asshur' and to 'afflict Eber.' Neither Leibnitz and Delitzsch,[1] who suppose a prophecy of Alexander the Great and the overthrow of the Persian empire, nor Cornill,[2] who supposes that vv.$^{20-24}$ (or at anyrate v.^{24}) are a late insertion of the fourth century, can possibly be right; they are all equally hasty, because they base their theories on an uncorrected text. Professor Hommel is not open to this charge. But his 'jackals and wild cats' (צִיִּים and אִיִּים), *i.e.* the predatory maritime peoples which invaded Syria and Palestine on their way to Eygpt as far back as the thirteenth century B.C., are out of the question in such a poem as this; the poem is manifestly later, and the invasion would not have been thus described (contrast the Song of Deborah). 'Chittim,' then, which Professor Hommel keeps, is impossible. A mention of the kingdom of Sham'al, however, is quite in accordance with Balaam's reputed Aramæan origin, and, what is equally to the point, its name must have been familiar to Israelites of

[1] *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, 1888, pp. 119 ff.
[2] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 3rd ed. p. 78.

any political inquisitiveness in the Assyrian period of Israelitish history.

It may be asked, How does 'Hamath' come into the little poem on Sham'al? But how can we avoid inserting in line 2 of the poem some proper name which shall be parallel to Sham'al? To the words, 'Who shall survive from Sham'al,' we expect to find as a parallel, 'Who shall escape from *x*.' Now the name of the capital of Sham'al is, I believe, unknown to us; its name might conceivably be such as could be corrupted into כתים. But consider this point—that though Sham'al was well known to the Israelites of the Assyrian period, it was only known as one of a group of states. The strong probability is that the name of some neighbouring state in equal danger from the Assyrians was mentioned in the second line. Now, in both the lists of tributary princes left us by Tiglath Pileser III.[1] (745–727), we find Hamath and Sham'al mentioned together. The name before Hamath is illegible in one list; in the other it is Carchemish. Hamath is again and again referred to in the Old Testament; we have a right to expect it to be mentioned in one or another of the poems ascribed to an Aramæan seer. And there are two other places which we could not be surprised at finding in such a context. These are Carchemish and Arpad, but especially the latter (cf. 2 K 18^{34}, Is 10^{9}, Jer 49^{23}). I suppose, then, that כְּתִים in line 2 is a corruption of חֲמָת (transposition and confusion of ח and כ), just as in Is 11^{11} חמת is probably a corruption of כתים, the only word which is suitable in the context (see *Isaiah*, in Haupt's Old Testament, Hebrew edition); and further, that אבד in v.[24] is a corruption of ארפד—an unfortunate word, which perhaps underlies the corrupt ערוער in Is 17^{2} (reading 'cities of Arpad' for 'cities of Aroer').

It may be urged, in opposition, that עֲדֵי אֹבֵד in v.[24] is protected by the occurrence of the same words at the end of v.[20], according to M.T. But I am not prepared to follow Professor D. H. Müller and Dr. Paul Ruben (see *Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1899), and do not find in Hebrew poetry as much deliberate use of correspondence of expression as these able scholars. עדי אבד is such a strange expression that we are bound to question its correctness, and it is by no means obvious that the true expression must be the same in both verses. But let us turn now to v.[20], which contains the improbable phrase, עדי אבד. I omit the detailed justification of the other corrections of the text which I have thus far proposed; parallels for each of them can easily be found by anyone who has enjoyed any competent instruction in textual criticism. (I will only refer for יְרוֹשֵׁשׁ to Jer 5^{17}, Mal 1^{4}; the word is obviously most appropriate in the present context.)

The difficulty of the little poem on Amalek is confined to the closing line. The reader will soon see how I deal with it—

20 רֵאשִׁית גּוֹיִם עֲמָלֵק	The first of the nations was Amalek;
וְאַחֲרִיתוֹ אֶרוֹם וְאָבֵד	But its last man shall Edom destroy.

Dillmann has already remarked on the generality of the saying on Amalek, as given in M.T. He accounts for it by the unimportance of Amalek from the present point of view of the writer. But in this case why mention Amalek at all? The 'first of the nations' in its own estimation, surely Amalek was not out of all relation to the immediate object of the poet. The strong probability is that עדי אבד conceals a definite reference to the agent by whom the destruction of Amalek was to be effected. A somewhat enigmatical notice in 1 Ch $4^{42.43}$ now comes to our assistance. It is there stated that five hundred men of the tribe of Simeon went to Mount Seir, and 'smote the remnant of the Amalekites that escaped.' From whom had these Amalekites escaped? Not from Saul (1 S 15), for David was still troubled by them (1 S 30). The conquest of Amalek ascribed to David in 2 S 8^{12}, is due, as Budde has shown (see also H. P. Smith, *ad loc.*) to a very late redactor. Probably, then, from their neighbours the Edomites, who were continually liable to have their settlements destroyed by those Bedouins, the Amalekites. Sam., Onk., Pesh. all read עד יאבד; this is nearer the truth than M.T.'s reading. Only עד is miswritten for [ום]אד.

Now we have a parallel to the definite statement which we have found respecting Edom in v.[22b]. Edom destroys the Kenites; Edom, too, exterminates the Amalekites. The poet lived before that part of the reign of Hezekiah which is referred to in 1 Ch 4^{42}, for he makes Balaam anticipate that the last man of the Amalekites will be slain by the Edomites; the chronological indication is

[1] See Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, p. 202.

of some slight importance. But he certainly lived not earlier than the reign of Ahaz, for he has distinctly in view the fall of Sham'al, Hamath, and Arpad.

These short *mĕshālīm* (Nu 24^{20-24}) are probably not by the author of the four longer poems (Nu 23^{1}–24^{19}). In those fine specimens of Hebrew poetry I have not many points of importance to mention. Some admirable corrections of the text have been made by my predecessors (notably Kuenen in Nu 23^{3}); it would be pleasing to refer to them, but I leave this task to the commentator in the International Series (T. & T. Clark), and to the writers in the two new Bible Dictionaries.

The first relates to the passage (Nu 23^{22}) rendered thus in R.V.—

> God bringeth them forth out of Egypt;
> He hath as it were the strength of the wild ox.

For 'strength' a marginal substitute is given, viz. 'horns.' The Hebrew word is תּוֹעֲפֹת. I have already shown (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, x. p. 94 [1898]) that in all the passages where this supposed word occurs, it is a corruption. The right word here is certainly תִּפְאֶרֶת. 𝔊 has δόξα, and δόξα is one of the words by which 𝔊 is accustomed to render תפארת. Render therefore v.^{22} thus—

> God, who brought him out of Egypt,
> Is for him like the wild ox's ornament.

i.e. the God of Israel makes Israel's attacks as irresistible as those of the wild ox. To this I would now add that the same word should be restored in v.^{21b}.[1] R.V. renders v.^{21b} thus—

> The LORD his God is with him,
> And the shout of a king is among them.

The words are usually explained (*e.g.* by Wellhausen) as referring to the kingly government in Israel. But this does not suit the context. 𝔊 has τὰ ἔνδοξα (*ἀρχόντων*), *i.e.* תפארת, which is certainly right. 'The glory of the king' (so render) means the visible presence of Yahwè, symbolized and represented by the ark (cf. Ps 78^{61}).

The second relates to Nu 24^{6b}, rendered in R.V.—

> As lign-aloes which the LORD hath planted,
> As cedar trees beside the waters.

But how can cedars be said to grow 'beside waters'? Dr. Post (Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i. 69, 364) supposes that either the location of the *ărāzīm* is poetic licence, or else some water-loving tree is intended in this passage. The introduction of the *ăhālīm* (masc. plur., nowhere else) is also unexpected; the aloe-tree does not grow in Palestine. The remedy is clear. Usage requires that the 'cedars' should be described as the trees which Yahwè planted (Ps 104^{16}). Read—

> As cedars (כארזים) which Yahwè hath planted,
> As poplars (ערבים) beside the waters.

Then continue, taking a hint from 𝔊 (*κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν*),

יִרְגְּזוּ לְאֻמִּים מֵחִילוֹ[2]	Peoples shall tremble at his might,
וּזְרֹעוֹ בְּעַמִּים רַבִּים[3]	And his arm[3] shall be on many nations,
וְיָרֶם מֵעוֹג מַלְכּוֹ	And his king shall be higher than *Og*,
וְתִנָּשֵׂא כַּלְכָּתוֹ	And his kingdom shall be exalted.

Lastly, I come to the chief point of all. It relates to the origin of the seer Balaam.[4] As is well known, tradition was not quite unanimous on this point. The Elohistic narrative, according to M.T., makes Balaam an Aramæan of Pethor on the Euphrates. The Yahwistic narrative (J), however, makes him a resident in the land of the Ammonites (reading בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן *bnē* Ammon, Nu 22^{5}), and the Priestly narrative (P) connects him with the Midianites. But there is strong reason to think that this view of E's meaning is erroneous. As that acute critic J. Marquart has pointed out (though he stopped short there), Pĕthōr cannot be the Pitru of the Assyrian inscriptions with which Schrader (*Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O.T.* [*KAT*] 155) has identified it, and the statement in Gn 36^{32} suggests a revolutionary theory. In Nu 22^{5} פתורה is miswritten for רְחוֹבֹת. Render the verse thus, distributing it between E and J—'And he sent messengers to Balaam, son of Beor (more probably Achbor), to Rehoboth, which is by the River [of Muṣri], *the land of the children of Ammon*' (the words in italics are from J). 'Rehoboth' is the place to which Saul, an Edomite king, traced his origin (Gn 36^{37}); it is also, as I have shown elsewhere (*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, May 1899), disguised under the name Dinhabah (Gn 36^{32}), and it is probably the Rehoboth of the story of Isaac (Gn 26^{22}). The reputation of the Edomites for wisdom is well known (Jer 49^{7}, Ob v.^{8},

[1] Verses 21 and 22 are not, as it seems, by the same writer. Cf. Bacon, *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*.

[2] Cf. Moore's correction יִרְגְּזוּ for נָזָה in Is 52^{15}.

[3] So already Grätz.

[4] Cf. article in the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 15th May 1899.

Job 2[11]), and Muṣri adjoined Edom. Probably, indeed, the phrase 'the wisdom of Mizraim' (1 K 4[30]) should rather be read 'the wisdom of Miṣrim,' *i.e.* the wisdom of Muṣri.[1] Miṣrim and its wisdom passed away and left no trace, not from Jewish antagonism to the neighbours of the Edomites, but ultimately in consequence of the scantiness of the historical records of the Israelites. The cause of the series of misunderstandings to which the Hebrew text of Nu 22[5] adds one more, was simply historical ignorance. We owe much to Winckler for removing the veil which has obscured the many references to Muṣri, though a few of these references even he has failed to notice.

[1] See 'References to the N. Arabian land of Muṣri,' *Jewish Quarterly Review*, July 1899.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS XXII. 1–2.

'And it came to pass after these things, that God did prove Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham; and he said, Here am I. And He said, Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

THIS first portion of the fourth section of the life of Abraham corresponds with those of the call, of the covenant sacrifice, of the institution of circumcision, which open the three preceding sections. The father of the faithful is now perfected. The obedience of faith drew Abraham into a strange land; by the humility of faith he gave way to his nephew Lot; strong in faith, he fought four kings of the heathen with three hundred and eighteen men; firm in faith, he rested in the word of promise, notwithstanding all the opposition of reason and nature; bold in faith, he entreated the preservation of Sodom under increasingly lowered conditions; joyful in faith, he received, named, and circumcised the son of promise; with the loyalty of faith he submitted at the bidding of God to the will of Sarah and expelled Hagar and Ishmael; and with the gratitude of faith he planted a tamarisk to the ever faithful God in the place where Abimelech had sued for his friendship and accepted his present,—now his faith was to be put to the severest test to prove itself victorious, and to be rewarded accordingly.—DELITZSCH.

'God.'—Literally, *the Elohim*, *i.e.* neither Satan nor Abraham himself, in the sense that a subjective impulse on the part of the patriarch supplied the formal basis of the subsequent transaction; but the El-Olam of chap. 21[33], the term Elohim being employed by the historian to indicate the true origin of the after-mentioned trial, which proceeded neither from Satanic instigation nor from subjective impulse, but from God.—WHITELAW.

'God did prove Abraham.'—Much difficulty has been most needlessly found in those words. St. James tells us that 'God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man,' language which it has been thought difficult to reconcile with this history in Genesis. So some have endeavoured to explain away the words of this passage, as though Abraham had felt a strong temptation arising in his own heart, a temptation from Satan, or from self, a horrible thought raised perhaps by witnessing the human sacrifices of the Phœnicians, and had then referred the instigation to God, thinking he was tempted from above, whereas the real temptation was from beneath. The difficulty, however, has arisen from not observing the natural force of the word here rendered 'did tempt,' and the ordinary use of that word in the language of the Old Testament, especially of the Pentateuch. According to the highest authorities, the primary sense of the verb corresponds with that of a similar word in Arabic, viz. 'to smell,' and thence 'to test by smelling.' Hence it came to signify close, accurate, delicate testing or trying. It is translated by 'prove,' 'assay,' 'adventure,' 'try,' and that very much more frequently than it is by 'tempt.' For instance, David would not take the sword and armour of Saul, because he had not 'proved them.' Again, he prayed in the words, 'Examine me, O Lord, and *prove* me' (Ps 26[2]); and in very numerous and familiar passages in the Pentateuch we read of God 'proving' men, whether they would be obedient or disobedient, the same Hebrew verb being constantly made use of. Accordingly, whilst most of the versions adhere closely to the sense of 'try,' *tentare*, in this passage, the Arabic renders it very correctly, 'God did prove Abraham.'—BROWNE.

ABRAHAM had in the midst of his Canaanite surroundings the practice of sacrificing children before his eyes. He saw how the heathen surrendered their dearest to appease the deity and render him propitious. Hence the question might easily arise within: Wouldst thou be able to do the like to please thy God? Justice is done to the words

'God tested him' when we thus psychologically account for the testing becoming a temptation. The temptation had its origin in him, and it became a test when God received it into His plan, and gave it a pre-descried goal. God desired thus to try him that he might stand the test. —DELITZSCH.

'**The land of Moriah.**'—The Moriah (with the article) is the name of the temple hill in Jerusalem, from the time of Solomon the most important place of worship in the country. In spite of the objections raised, this is the place we must suppose to be intended here, for no other place of the name is found, and Abraham's greatest deed of faith was best localized in a sacred spot of importance. —DILLMANN.

'**Offer him there for a burnt offering.**'—The command is justified by the result. God meant to make it the means of educating Abraham, not only to a deeper faith, but to a truer view of sacrifice. Human sacrifice was common among the tribes with which Abraham was familiar, and no doubt he too believed that as one's best must be given to God, it might be needful even to sacrifice a son. The problem was to disentangle in Abraham's mind what was true from what was mistaken; to maintain in his mind the right impression that all should be given up to God, and at the same time to explode the idea that the best way to give up a life to God was to put an end to it. He is by the whole transaction made to see that it is right to sacrifice his son, but wrong to slay him; that the human sacrifice which is pleasing to God is the trusting spirit of perfected obedience, not the actual blood or deprivation of life.—DODS.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

The Father of the Faithful.

There are two aspects in which we view Abraham's life.

1. He is a great religious reformer. God called him to leave idolatry and serve the only living and true God. He was selected to begin a new and separate worship, which should stand upon God's unity and God's righteousness. He had faith in God and was worthy of the selection.

2. He is the Founder of a Family. Abraham left Ur to seek a home. His passion was to found a family. He did not find the home he sought. He wandered up and down the country,—Shechem, Bethel, Hebron, Gerar, Beersheba, Egypt, the Philistines,—and at last he had to *buy* as much ground as was necessary to lay Sarah in. But surely he will found a family. See his passionate desire for a son; and it is shared by Sarah. Ishmael is born. Then comes the promise of a son who shall be the beginning of the great family. Abraham listens and is not unbelieving, but—'Oh! that Ishmael might live before thee!' Isaac is born. How apt an illustration is Sir Walter Scott. This was his passion also—not fame but a family. Then Abbotsford is built; then comes the failure of Constable, the gigantic debt, the heroic struggle, death. It takes fifteen years of the copyright profits still to pay the debts. The family dies out; Abbotsford passes into other hands.

But it is God's will that Abraham should found a family. Not merely to perpetuate a name; but to preserve a race, to hand down pure religion. Abraham is to be the father of the *faithful*. Hence comes discipline. No home, no son. And when Ishmael comes, there is rejection. When Isaac comes, there is sacrifice.

On that sacrifice the family was founded. Abraham received Isaac back from God the first-born from the dead. In him and in his seed we see the crucifiers of the flesh with its affections and its lusts.

II.

The Trial of Abraham.

By the Rev. F. W. Robertson, M.A.

In every life there comes one great crisis. Abraham had had many trials, but this was the chief. Trial here is indispensable for the purifying of the soul, and Abraham was by no means a perfect man; he must be perfected by trial.

1. There are difficulties in this trial. God seems to require what is wrong—to sanction human sacrifice. But take the story as a whole, and the sacrifice is forbidden. He really required the surrender of the father's will, not the son's life. God did not even require what *seemed* wrong to Abraham, for he was familiar with human sacrifices, and his conscience would not be outraged by the command as ours should be. Some men think conscience may be sacrificed as a duty, arguing that if it is noble to sacrifice life, it is more so to sacrifice your soul. Had Abraham outraged his conscience, it would not have been faith but sin.

2. The trial was made under aggravated circumstances. The command is couched in words of accumulated keenness. Abraham himself

must offer the sacrifice. There is no loophole of escape.

3. The spirit in which the trial was met. (1) Without ostentation. Abraham told no one what he meant to do, and took no witnesses. Love of display mars our sacrifices. The world knows too much of our feelings, and deeds, and sacrifices, therefore the Redeemer demanded quietness, calmness, and secrecy. (2) Abraham was in earnest. He meant to take his son's life, and really believed he would return childless.

Consider three things in conclusion.

1. The Christian sacrifice is the surrender of will. God demands entire surrender of ourselves to His will. This explains the principle of the Atonement. The sacrifice of Christ was acceptable to God, not because He delights in the shedding of blood, but because He demands the the surrender of will, the blending of the human with the divine.

2. For a true sacrifice there must be real love. 'Thy son whom thou *lovest*.' He who prefers his friend or child to the call of duty will soon show that he prefers himself to both.

3. We must not *seek* for sacrifices. Plenty will occur by God's appointment, and better than if devised by you. Every hour and moment our will may yield as Abraham's did, quietly, manfully, unseen by all but God. These are the sacrifices which God approves.

Illustrations.

God *tried* Abraham. He proved him whether he was worthy of being the hope of mankind. Man learns the disposition of his heart best by its manifestations; for though the will may be virtuous, it often lacks the energy to mature into deed. This effort is the merit of man, and constitutes a chief part of his earthly task. God therefore sends trials to those He loves: He tried the Israelites immediately after they left Egypt at the waters of Marah, that they might convince themselves whether they were worthy of the miraculous redemption; He tried them by the edict concerning the daily gathering of the manna; by the proclamation of the Decalogue, and by not extirpating all the heathen in Canaan, that they might show the strength of their belief by keeping aloof from contamination; He sent even sometimes false prophets, performing miracles but preaching false gods and idolatrous doctrines, to try their fortitude in adhering to the Law. But all such trials are sent only when weakness and sin preceded; although they may end in great reward, they imply the possibility of still greater sin; and, therefore, man justly prays 'not to be led into temptation.' We must understand the great trial of Abraham from the same point of view; he had, from fear of his own life, twice risked the honour of his wife; and he might naturally have felt for his son an excessive love. By the triumph which he gained in this trial he was purified from his weakness, and he atoned for it. Hence, also, the enormity of the crime is obvious if man tries God, as the Israelites did more than once, when they desired to know 'whether God was among them or not,' a sin always counted among the most heinous forms of blasphemy.—M. M. Kalisch.

It is recorded of the Emperors of Russia and Austria, and the King of Prussia, that they were one day discussing the relative absolute unquestioning obedience of their soldiers. Each claimed the palm, of course, for his own soldiers. They agreed to test the matter at once. They were sitting in a room on the second storey in a house, and they determined each to call up a soldier, and to order him to leap out of the window. The Prussian monarch first called his man. 'Leap out of that window,' he said to him. 'Your majesty, it would kill me,' was the reply; and he was sent down. Then an Austrian soldier was called, and the emperor ordered him to leap out of the window. 'I will,' said the man, 'if your majesty really means it.' He was sent down; and the Czar of Russia called his man, and gave him the same order. Without a word the man crossed himself, and started for the window to do it. Of course he was stopped ere he could leap out, but to all intents and purposes he did make the leap; and whatever there was of agony of feeling connected with that leap, he felt.—A. C. Price.

In Abraham there was really the belief that he would come back childless. Had he expected what took place, it had been no sacrifice. Some persons make sacrifices, expecting to be repaid. They say and teach: Do right, and you will not be the worse; give up, and somehow or other God will make it up to you. True, 'he that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord.' But if you do it with that feeling your reward is lost; it is not religion but mere traffic, barter; you only sacrifice little in order to gain much. If you make a sacrifice expecting that God will return you your Isaac, that is a sham sacrifice, not a real one. Therefore, if you make sacrifices let them be *real*. You will have infinite gain; yes; but it must be done with an earnest heart, expecting nothing in return. There are times, too, when what you give to God will never be repaid in kind. Isaac is not always restored; but it will be repaid by love, truth, and kindness.—F. W. Robertson.

A missionary in China, describing in the *Sunday at Home* the sacrifices which are offered to Confucius at the autumnal equinoxes, says: 'We looked at the victims, and they were diseased, scraggy brutes: worthless offerings. Oh the mockery and the utter insincerity and indifference of the Chinese mind to all sense of honour! My friend explained the matter to me; he said they were allowed so much by the treasury for this purpose, and the cheaper they could get the animals the more they could pocket.'—J. F. B. Tinling.

LORD, what have I that I may offer Thee?
Look, Lord, I pray Thee and see.—

What is it thou hast got?
Nay, child, what is it thou hast not?
Thou hast all gifts that I have given to thee:
Offer them all to Me,
The great ones and the small,
I will accept them one and all.—

I have a will, good Lord, but it is marred;
A heart both crushed and hard:
Not such as these the gift
Clean-handed, lovely saints uplift.—

Nay, child, but wilt thou judge for Me?
I crave not thine but thee.—

Ah, Lord, who lovest me!
Such as I have now give I Thee.—C. ROSSETTI.

Sermons for Reference.

Ahlfeld (F.), Voice from the Cross, 135.
Bell (C. D.), Hills that bring Peace, 45.
Calthrop (G.), Eden to Patmos, 11.
Clifford (J.), Daily Strength for Daily Living, 19.
Colenso (J. W), Natal Sermons, i. 356.
Grubb (G. C.), Unsearchable Riches, 89.
Hessey (J. A.), Moral Difficulties in the Bible, i. 83.
Kennedy (J.), Sermons at Dingwall, 468.
Maurice (F. D.), Doctrine of Sacrifice, 33.
Mozley (J. B.), Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, 31, 64.
Parker (J.), Adam, Noah, and Abraham, 169.
Perowne (J. J. S.), Sermons, 332.
Price (A. C.), Fifty Sermons, x. 193.
Robertson, F. W.), Notes on Genesis, 50.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xv. No. 868.

The Hittite Inscriptions.

IN REPLY TO PROFESSOR HOMMEL.

BY PROFESSOR P. JENSEN, PH.D., MARBURG.

IN the May number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES Professor Hommel criticises my last book, *Hittiter und Armenier*, without—strangely enough—saying a single word about the new arguments contained in my article in the April number of this same magazine. For his criticism I tender him my sincerest thanks, for, in seeking to represent my conclusions as weak or unfounded, he shows how little assailable they are in the main.

While in several passages in the inscriptions he substitutes other place names for the ones adopted by me, he admits—without making this prominent, to be sure—that I have rightly recognized the position of these names in the inscriptions, namely, at the beginning of the latter before a cone or an equivalent group of signs, and in this way he concedes a *chief* basis for my further decipherments. But in thus implicitly admitting that the group just named, like the simple cone, stands for 'king,' and, further, that a certain sign occurring between this group and a place name marks, at least in one instance, a genitive ending, he concedes additional data which were and are of importance for the work of decipherment. Hommel admits, moreover, that in certain inscriptions, *e.g.* that of Bor, a transcription and translation of which I attempted in the April number, I have rightly taken a group x-y-z-x as indicating a title. He concedes also that I am right in taking a certain sign to mean 'queen,' and in referring it to a goddess (the great goddess). But this carries with it a further admission. For, according to Hommel, I appear to be right also in reading 'king of *Karkemish*' before this sign in two passages of an inscription of Jerabîs. Now, as Hommel also agrees, the expression in question ('king of Karkemish') stands in the first of these passages in the nominative, and the sign for the queen-goddess, as he also admits, is followed by an expression in the nominative. But, seeing that the inscription emanates from a king, not from a queen, the 'queen' of the inscription cannot under any circumstances form an apposition to 'king of Karkemish,' but must be dependent upon the following nominative expression. The latter in that way will indicate a relation of the king to the 'queen,' as I have maintained, and as has proved of importance for the interpretation of the inscriptions of Bulgarmaden, Bor, and Andaval, and now of the greatest importance for the

interpretation of the Lion inscription of Mar'ash. Once more, this sign for 'queen' appears at Fraktin before a goddess, along with a group which I found also before the queen of the gods at Boghazköi. Before this goddess there stands also, as I finally discovered, a fist. Since now Hommel would surely admit that what stands before the divinities at Boghazköi must be recognized to be their names and titles, he will concede that the fist which has such remarkable prominence in the inscriptions represents the queen of the gods, as I insisted anew in my reply to Sayce, without any protest having been offered by Hommel. And along with the fist as her symbol, he will also, in accordance with my argumentation (*l.c.*), be led to accept of the open hand as the symbol of the king of the gods, and therewith a whole series of other hand hieroglyphs which occur in succession at Jerabīs (Inscrip I. and II.), and in the Lion inscription in an order determined by considerations of rank, must be viewed as god hieroglyphs, and the expressions which follow or precede them, as indicating the relation of the author of the inscriptions to them. But in this way Hommel implicitly recognizes that my interpretation of the inscriptions, *e.g.* that of Bor, is correct as far as the general contents are concerned. And yet by his reply he implicitly denies that my decipherings has so much as broken ground. This I call preposterous. And if Hommel was not aware of this self-contradiction, it is evident that, in spite of his declaration at the beginning of his article, he has not yet reached a comprehensive view of the inscriptions.

But, further, if Hommel, not merely on account of my decipherings, but because it is proclaimed by the rocky walls at Boghazköi, must assume with me that a series of hand hieroglyphs are god hieroglyphs, it must strike him as remarkable that there is never found in conjunction with these the sign in which he and Sayce see a variant of the sign for 'god' at Boghazköi, but which I regard as the hieroglyph for 'land.' When, besides, this alleged variant is never exactly the same as the Boghazköi sign for 'god,' sound reason must compel Hommel to separate the one category from the other. But then there remains not a shadow of ground to oppose my reading of the sign as 'land,' 'city,' 'district.' Hommel concedes, further, that this sign is followed on the 'Bowl' inscription by a group, for which the reading *Karkemīsh* (a city name) is probable, and at Bulgarmaden is both followed and preceded by a group in which he as well as myself sees an expression for 'king'! Still *this* proves little for one who has not yet any idea of the contents of the inscriptions. The oldest form of this sign is a circle, with two parallel strokes drawn through it and having on either side two semi-circles parallel with the circle. One cannot avoid supposing that what this is meant to represent is a city, through which and out of which on two sides a highway leads, and the surrounding district under the city's jurisdiction. That is at least no forced explanation. But Hommel brings against me the Amulet (!) inscription recently published by Hayes Ward. Well, in the first place, I would remark that Hommel is not quite just to me in his translation, according to my deciphering. For it was only in my first work and quite conjecturally and with a query that I equated the word *ar-s* in the inscriptions with the Armenian *arats* = 'shepherd,' but since then I have long abandoned the attempt at an exact interpretation, and consequently in my last book I have left this word quite out of account. Beyond this, I have no essential exception to take to Hommel's rendering, after my decipherment scheme, except that a sign for 'worshipper,' ('servant') (*paštaunëai*) occurring at the end of the inscription is ignored by him. I have to protest, however, against his notion that the translation furnishes a *reductio ad absurdum* of my position. For even if the symbol in the inscription which I formerly took as another expression for 'king' need not have this sense, it expresses a relation between a king or a god and a land, and the 'brave *ar-s* x of Cilicia and *Arz(ṣ)auia* (?),' whose worshipper the possessor of the amulet styles himself, is perhaps the same who is called in Inscrip. III. from Jerabīs the king of kings, the Hittite Hercules and god of war, the god who, according to my latest results appears under one name or another in very many amulet inscriptions. The whole inscription, according to my deciphering, runs: 'Of the *ar-s* brave x of Cilicia and *Arz(ṣ)auia* (?) y servant (*or* worshipper).' What y (the serpent above the sign for 'worshipper') signifies I cannot say. But suppose we grant the entire possibility that, as Hayes Ward and Hommel assume, it is a divine symbol, or even that it stands actually for the king of gods, namely, the weather-and-lightning god, representing him perhaps in the latter aspect. Granted, fur-

ther, that it is quite possible that what precedes runs parallel to this, and characterizes the king of the gods and not the god of war (in any case, in the inscription of Ordasu, as I now know, the king of the gods is called the ruler of Melitene, if not perhaps of Hati). Yet these possibilities, as is evident, do not shatter in the least my interpretation of the land hieroglyph. By the way, Hommel will hardly expect us surely to follow him in tracing a connexion between the Greek δράκων and the Hittite divine name *Tarkhu*, in which he sees the above-named serpent god. A Hittite word for 'serpent' borrowed by the Greeks! What an idea!

To proceed. I said that Hommel has directly and indirectly accepted of a very large part of my decipherments, *e.g.* in the case of the inscription of Bor essentially the whole of the commencement. But the king must have named himself, and that, too, somehow at the commencement of the inscriptions. Now, if at the commencement of the inscription of Bor we introduce the interpretations of the signs and sign groups which Hommel directly and indirectly sanctions, then, after deducting relatively frequent or very frequent groups or individual signs which as expressions for personal names cannot come into consideration, there remains for the king's name precisely the group which I claim as indicating this. But now it is just this which stands at the very opening of Jerabîs I. before the expression for which Hommel himself concedes to me an interpretation such as 'king of Karkemish,' and in another inscription, that of Ordasu at Melitene-Malatya, likewise before a group for which Hommel implicitly concedes to me the general sense of 'king of the land of so and so.' One must admit that the name is discovered by me at a very appropriate place. Hommel, however, who does not follow out the consequences of his concessions, finds the Ordasu king's name in a different place, namely, nearer the commencement, in a group of three signs. This group he reads *Tarḫunazi*, and, as we know only one king of Melitene of this name, he must feel compelled, until decisive grounds forbid it, to assign the inscription to this king's time. Well, I have done exactly the same in assigning it to his successor *Mud(t)alu*. Hommel, by his reading of the name, thus implicitly bears witness to the correctness of my chronology. But the date was to me a weighty argument in favour of my assumption that the inscription emanated from *Mud(t)alu* of Kommagene, who, Sargon tells us, had temporary possession also of Melitene! Thus against his will Hommel turns out everywhere to be a witness in favour of, instead of against me.

As to what Hommel puts in place of my readings, I may leave the judgment to my readers, contenting myself merely with the following remarks. In inscriptions found to the west of the Taurus in what *was* demonstrably, at least in later times Cilician territory, x-y-z-x is, as Hommel himself admits, the chief title of the kings, and one of these kings, whose inscription has been preserved in full, calls himself, as Hommel also concedes, king of *a*-x. And all kings of Cilicia of whom the Greeks speak as *living and reigning* are called *Syennes-i-s* (where *-s* is the Gr. ending). Hence it was long ago assumed, although not universally, that Syennesis was the title or reigning name of the kings of Cilicia. Thus, at least very possibly, the first and the last consonant in the title and the last in the name of the capital of the Cilician kings, Tarsus, had the same or a quite similar sound, and therefore I considered myself justified in adopting the reading, 'The *Syennes-is* king of *Tars-us*' for a group x-y-z-x and a following a(+b)+x 'king' at the beginning of an inscription from what was demonstrably, at least in later times, Cilician territory. This interpretation appeared evident enough, and it has approved itself as such to a great many. But according to Hommel, it is impossible. For—thus he utters his dictum—Syennesis is no title, and—he knows it for certain—in *Syennes-is* the second *s* is the Cilician nominative ending, nor does he shrink from adducing for comparison the Median (!) *Zualzash*. And this is put forward without a single vestige of proof. Strange that Hommel did not recollect Hittite names like *Tarḫu-nazi* on the one hand, and Νησ-ι-ς and Ῥω-νησ-ι-ς on the other (see my *Hittiter u. Armenier*, p. 225), which, had it been a case of producing evidence in his own favour, he would certainly have cited as decisive against the view stated above! To think that one should still have to argue against such idle fancies!

But now what would Hommel substitute for my readings? Since he discovers in Eastern Asia Minor no kingly title answering to the group x-y-z-x, he goes to Lydia (!), finds there the word παλμυ-ς = 'king;' prepares this for his purpose by

evolving from it *vialvi* (!), and behold the reading of the Eastern Asia Minor title is discovered! Then for *Tars-* he reads the name *Kavi*, which at least approximately was borne by a small district on the Gulf of Issus, between which and the locality of our inscription Cilicia lay (!), and about whose kings we do *not* know that they ever held sway to the west of the Taurus. In doing this he identifies *ad hoc* the first sign of the group standing for the name of the country with another sign read by me *k(a,o)*, which, as Inscrip. III. from Jerabîs might have sufficed to show him, is totally different from it. But he now offers a still further choice of reading for the kingly title, namely, *Desanda-s*, the *name* of a Cappadocio-Cilician god (!), and, corresponding to this, for *Tars-us* the reading *Kode* an Egyptian (!) designation (meaning 'circle') for a district in N. Syria, or perhaps N.W. of this, but which we cannot define more specifically! And in this Hommel does not observe that in proposing the Cappadocio-Cilician divine name as title of the king, he must at all events concede the possibility that the latter, as I maintain, is precisely the king of Cilicia. If one of us is right, there can surely be no discussion about which of us it is.

But the worst feature of my deciphering is, in Hommel's estimation, that I contend for the Armenianism of the language. For, to begin with —so he argues—even if I am right in my readings, the words I obtain are comparable also with words from other languages. My *m-s* = 'great' may be placed side by side with the Scythian (Iranian) *maz* with the same meaning; my *s* ('-*s*) = 'I' with the Vannic *iesh(e)* [in which -*sh(e)* is most probably the ending of the nominative!]; my *mi* [in case my Armenian hypothesis is correct, say *emi*] = 'I am' with the Sumerian *mi* = 'to be' (!), and on the other hand with the Vannic ending (!) -*ubi* for the 1st person sing. of the perfect (!), and, assuming the correctness of Hommel's *m-vi* instead of *m-s* for 'great,' with -μοας in Cilician names, a termination whose meaning is absolutely unknown to us!

I have already indicated above by parenthetical additions why such comparisons, to put it mildly, are impracticable, with the possible exception of that of *m-s* with the Iranian *maz*. And this particular comparison might be adduced, according to Hommel, in favour of the Indo-Germanic character of the language, and thus, he himself being witness, in my favour—provided, that is to say, such arguments have any weight. But this they have not. For two languages are not proved to be cognate simply because here and there coincidences between them can be pointed out, and the course of argument by which I sought to establish the Armenianism of the inscriptions consisted not in adducing such isolated coincidences, but in showing that the Hittite words obtained by me, for which I had at least approximately hit the right sense recur in Armenian at least in the majority of instances, with the same or a quite similar sense and in a form *changed in accordance with the established Armenian laws of phonetics*. Only in the case of two words was I unsuccessful, namely, the word *dzar(i)o* for 'king,' and a supposed word *emio* for 'powerful,' or the like. But this apparent obstacle has meanwhile been removed. On the one hand *emio* has to be replaced by *mio* = 'one,' and this corresponds to the Armen. *mi* = the older *mio*, on the other hand by *im(oi)o*, 'my *or* mine' = Armen. *im(oy)* from the older *im(oi)o*, and finally, in at least four passages where a name of the great goddess is in view, by *Ma-a*, probably = Μα, the presumptive name of the great goddess at Komana in Hittite-Cilician territory.—Then as to the Hittite word for 'king,' *dzar(i)o*, this is not indeed directly demonstrable as Armenian, yet indirectly in so far as the inscriptional hieroglyph, *i.e.* the Rebus for 'king,' as exhibited by the oldest inscriptions, those of Hamath, is a tree, and 'tree' in Armenian is *tsar*, probably from an older *dzaro*.

It should be evident that there is a radical difference between being able for a few of my Hittite words to adduce words or mere endings having a partial assonance, drawn from different languages and with different or even unknown meanings, and being able to bring forward a language in which the whole of the Hittite terms recovered by me, as far as their meaning is established, recur with the same or a very similar sense, and in precisely the form which in accordance with the laws of the Armenian language they must assume. Hence I cannot understand Hommel's wonder that in my latest book I have not taken account of the language of the Vannic inscriptions which he thinks [why?] would have been much nearer my purpose. It ought also to be clear that Hommel, instead of having shattered my position by his objections, has given it new strength: *Hommel could not discover any one language which answered so completely to my Hittite as the Armenian.*

But Hommel maintains, to be sure, that I compare things that are not comparable. For instance, I assume for Hittite an original ending *-s* in the nominative singular—which, however, does not appear in the *inscriptions*—and an ending *-m* in the genitive plural, and offer this as evidence of Armenianism. Hommel, on the other hand, remarks — let one listen and wonder! — that in Armenian an ending *-m* in the gen. plur. 'is no longer discoverable,' and that 'Armenian wants all traces of an original nominative in *-s*.' But no Indo-Germanic scholar doubts in the least that both these endings were once present, any more than he doubts that (contrary to the opinion of Lagarde and after him Hommel) an original *Hatio* = 'Hittite' must appear in Armenian as *Hay*, *i.e.* however, = 'Armenian.' Hommel cites the name *Tharhath*(!)*ay* occurring in the Armenian literature (from the Syrian *Tarʿatē*), and thinks this (!) might have shown me that a Hittite word *Khati* must appear in Armenian as *Hatay*, not *Hay*. Here again he shows that he has not grasped the real point at issue. *Tharhathay* is really a late foreign word in Armenian! Besides, I never asserted that *Hay* goes back to *Khati*, but to *Hatio*.

It is strange that Hommel, instead of playing off all these trivial objections against me, should not have acquainted his readers that also in every other instance where I have compared the Hittite vocabulary with the Armenian, the coincidence is exact: *e.g.* my *mi* (for which *emi* may be read) = 'I am' answers to the Armen. *em* from an older **emi*; my *-s* = 'I' to Armen. *es* from an older **eso*; my *a-i-s* = 'this' to Armen. *ais*; my *-s-t-r* = 'son' *or* 'child' to Armen. *ustr* = 'son'; etc.

What Hommel urges against my attempt to prove the Armenianism of Hittite from the phonetic values of the written symbols, is made up merely of possibilities, inaccuracies, and objections whose feebleness we have already noted above. I do not require to lay stress on this part of my proof so long as the evidence from the language of the inscriptions is unshattered, and in any case that argument cannot have the same weight as this last named. Hence, in the interest of my readers, I decline to give a detailed refutation of the pointless objections of Hommel, merely noting briefly the following points for the benefit of those who are inclined to go thoroughly into the question.—There is no evidence that Armen. *artsiv-artsui* 'eagle' is 'an ancient Iranian loan-word,' rather does the form evince it as genuine Armenian as long as data hitherto unknown to us cannot be brought forward to oppose this conclusion.—Hübschmann, who perhaps knows Armenian a little better than Hommel, does not adopt the view that *aman* and *anōth*, 'jar,' 'pitcher,' are loan-words, and I am not aware how *anōth* must be a loan-word from the Semitic. (Surely Hommel is not thinking of the Assyr. *unūti* 'utensils,' 'tools'?)—According to Armenian phonetic laws, *aragil*, 'stork,' cannot go back to an original *gharagil* or *varagil*.—Even if, when the Hittite writing was invented, the Armenian *orth*, 'calf,' was already represented by *forth*—but not by *porth*,—this would not affect my view that the calf's head (with the pronunciation *p* + *a* or *o*) witnesses in favour of the Armenianism of the language, seeing that I assume that this symbol stands for every labial sound (except *m*) with *a* or *o* following.—It is perfectly inexplicable to me how Hommel can see in the sign which I read *t*(*a*)*r*, 'a tied up wine-skin.' —The position of the hand in the hand hieroglyph, which I take to be = *h*(*a*)*t*, excludes the possibility that the instrument it holds is 'a gimlet or a style.' —I am not aware of any reason why the Hittites should not have indicated a worm or a caterpillar(!) by a semicircle. — Accordingly, the assertions Hommel opposes to my combinations are ineffectual. The same, according to what was remarked above, applies to his contention, *e.g.* that for the value *t* of the pointed shoe, instead of appealing to the Armen. *trekh*, 'peasant's shoe,' one might cite the Lesgian *tapi*, etc., 'shoe,' and for the value *k* of the ram's head, instead of the Armen. *khoy*, 'ram,' the Lesgian *kheb*, etc., 'sheep.'

Here is another subject of wonder to me. While Hommel incorrectly asserts that I read a foal's head as = *Mud*(*t*)*allu*, *simply* on the ground of the Armenian *mtruk* (perhaps from **mudal* + *uk*), and while he rejects this combination, he forgets to mention that in the closest connexion with this I read a certain group, namely, dog's head + lion's claw, indicating the name of the territory over which the above-named king rules, as = *Kom* + *magh-*, and that I combine these phonetic values with the Armenian words *gamphr* = 'dog' and *magil* = 'claw.' And these three combinations were the most important of all. From considerations which had *nothing* to do with the Armenianism of the language, the conclusion presented itself as very natural that the inscription

of Ordasu emanated from a king *Mud(t)alu* of Kommagene, and that consequently the foal's head, the dog's head, and the lion's claw should receive the above readings. And now the circumstance revealed itself that these readings, so far demanded already, corresponded, respectively, to an Armenian word for 'foal' and to the first parts of Armenian terms for 'dog' and 'claw.' Surely Hommel could have mentioned this.

I might say much more in reply to the incorrect statements and baseless objections of Hommel, but I will touch on only three points: (1) How comes he to assert that a reading *Shilkuaššeme* is impossible for the name of the king in the Assyrian version of the bilingual inscription? The group for the name consists of the sign for *tar*, *kut*, *shil*, *khas*, + that for *ḳu* or two for *bi*, + one for *u*, + sign for *ash*, + that for *she*, if not that for *mu*, although this is less likely, + sign for *me*. How then is my reading argued to be impossible? How long, truly, unfounded assertions can continue effective! On account of a late Cilician king Tarkondemos, and for no other reason, the name was for long read *Tarkūdimme*, the next to the last sign or rather the two signs next to the last being improperly identified with the sign for *dim*. Against this, following the example of Amiaud, I protested, but long in vain. The Tarkondemos must not be dethroned. Now, even Hommel perceives that before *me* there is no sign *DIM* but *MU*, yet, in order to rescue Tarkondemos, he ascribes to it the phonetic value *dim* which this sign has *nowhere* else!

(2) Hommel says that whenever his bird-goddess is named at all, she comes 'almost always' directly after his 'serpent god.' From this remark, as from other circumstances, it would look as if his acquaintance with the texts is very slight indeed. There are in all only two texts to which his remark is applicable. Such is his 'almost always,' which put in this way serves as the ground of an argument! By the way, I may tell Professor Hommel that *I*, as he is doubtless aware, cannot recognize his bird-goddess; on the other hand, I now know that the eagle, the same bird in which Hommel discovers her, certainly accompanies, without however being his symbol, the Hittite king of the gods as well as the god of Tarsus, who is identical with him. This we learn from a recently discovered amulet now in the possession of Hayes Ward, and I might have learned it even from the amulet with its legends published by Sayce in the *Archæological Journal*, 1887, following p. 348.

(3) Hommel, as remarked above, sees in the serpent upon the cylinder published by Hayes Ward a serpent god, and will have it that the figure in the inscription resembling a serpent is his symbol. This looks very evident to anyone viewing the figure given by Hommel on p. 369 of last month's EXPOSITORY TIMES, and might readily prejudice many a one who does not know the inscriptions against my interpretation 'Cilicia.' But one's judgment will be different when one learns that the figure drawn by Hommel is not identical with the serpent 'hieroglyph' in the inscriptions. *The latter* has exactly the same appearance on the left as on the right.

Finally, I owe my readers a reply to Professor Hommel's charge that I am unjust to Professor Sayce. I asserted that the latter had recovered from the Hittite inscriptions nothing but what any one could have seen who was not quite blind, and that a few important results reached by him hit the mark by a lucky chance. Hommel thinks that in this 'Professor Jensen seeks to depreciate as much as possible any correct results that have been reached by others before him,' and that Sayce's Hittite discoveries were made 'through the intuitive perception of genius.' On this it may be remarked: (*a*) Sayce formerly assumed rightly that a figure occurring at the beginning of many inscriptions, namely, a human head with an arm pointing to it, signified 'I,' but he afterwards replaced this by the interpretation 'says'; (*b*) a hieroglyph standing before numerous figures of gods, at Boghazköi in Asia Minor, is explained by Sayce rightly, no doubt,—though the proof for it is not yet forthcoming,—to be the sign for 'god'; (*c*) *because* in the 'Tarkondemos' inscription he *erroneously* (and in this I followed him till recently) saw in a cone a sign for 'king,' which he *erroneously* (and here again I followed him till recently) identified with a similar sign in the inscriptions, he *rightly* interpreted this latter sign as that for 'king'; (*d*) *because* in a Hittite sign in the same inscription he *erroneously* saw the second part of the supposed territorial name *Ermē* of the Assyrian legend, he *rightly* read this sign *me*. This is all that Sayce has discovered. I do not know why under these circumstances I was not justified in speaking as I did, and at all events I am unable to recognize in such discoveries 'the intuitive perception of genius.'

I am far indeed from regarding myself as infallible. Rather am I firmly convinced—and every day contributes to force this upon my attention—that my deciphering is in many points of detail merely ephemeral, and that in course of time much of it will crumble away. But that is not only excusable, it is a matter of course. I am but human. If one has the courage to think and to form combinations, he must frequently and in many ways fall into error. But when Hommel applies to what he cannot accept of the results I have reached by a severe process of thought the name 'absurdities,' he presents them in a light in which it seems to me they do not deserve to appear, even if Hommel's own views were correct. I believe, however, that the author of *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* and other works, not to speak of the critique with which I am dealing, is hardly the man to judge of what is absurd, and has no right to speak of the conclusions of his colleagues as 'absurdities.' 'He who sits in a glass house ought not to throw stones.'

I have replied to Professor Hommel more fully than I am accustomed to do on other occasions when I am wantonly assailed by him or others. Silence is in such cases generally the most effective defence. But as I am concerned that in England as well as in Germany the true state of this important question should be learned once for all, I have felt compelled to make an exception in this instance, and have gladly availed myself of the kind permission of the editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to express my views on Professor Hommel's article.

Having reached in my deciphering a point from which I daily gain deeper insight into the inscriptions, it strikes me as almost comical that even yet I should have to fight for my life. I can only wish that Hommel may continue to follow his own method of decipherment, disdaining to the uttermost my results, and reaching such conclusions, *e.g.* as that a sign, which occurs some dozen and a half times in the Lion inscription, instead of being a 'word-closer' (*Wortbeschliesser*), or the like, stands for 'son.' That is the surest and the shortest way to discover that when in the main points he abandons my methods he will find himself on a dead track; and as Hommel professes to have at heart only the victory of the truth, he will thus be brought to see and to confess that the inscriptions in the main can be deciphered only in the way in which I have done it.

I may say beforehand that I do not intend to notice any rejoinder Professor Hommel may choose to make. The above must suffice by way of answer to anything he may still bring forward against me, unless, instead of mere baseless assertions, he should adduce substantial arguments, showing that he at least knows the inscriptions, which as yet he does not.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

THE QUEST OF FAITH. By T. B. SAUNDERS. (*Black.* 8vo, pp. 191. 7s. 6d.)

NOT everyone who set out in quest of the Holy Grail found it. Mr. Saunders sets out in quest of Faith and finds it not. What he finds is that religion is a product of the human spirit. The loftier minds, the men of genius, have attained a loftier view than is granted to common humanity. And that loftier view is heaven. For a moment Mr. Saunders seemed to pause, content with 'an additional factor,' willing to describe it as 'Fate, Unknown Power, God, or whatever other term.' But even that was dismissed as needless. The human spirit alone engenders the tendency towards higher moral and social relations, which we call religion. But, in truth, Mr. Saunders does not set out in quest of Faith. He sets out to criticise all the recent popular books that handle matters of faith, and to show them unable to establish it. He criticises cleverly, and for the most part convincingly. But his own position is the most open to criticism of them all.

RECENT ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE BIBLE. By THE REV. THOMAS NICOL, D.D. (*Blackwood.* 8vo, pp. xii, 333. 9s. net.)

There are few things more urgently needed at present than a survey of recent Biblical Archæ-

ology. No one is able to keep pace with all the work unless he gives himself specially to it. No one is able to disentangle conflicting statements and detect immature theories unless he has all the facts at his finger ends. No one, in short, has any satisfaction at the present moment in using the results of exploration; they are too multifarious and too indefinite. We need a brief, capable survey, and Dr. Nicol has furnished it.

Dr. Nicol's volume contains the Croall Lectures for 1898. In their delivery these lectures attracted distinct attention. Since they were delivered Dr. Nicol has both travelled in the East and read most extensively in the relevant literature. The book is really much richer than the lectures were, they have had a wider field to cover, for even within a year there have been important finds, and they have been set at the point of view of the most recent scholarship. To those therefore who heard the lectures and drank them in, the volume will be welcome, at once corrective and informing.

Dr. Nicol covers the whole field of Biblical Archæology. For that we are thankful. It is a survey, a fireside handbook, we need, not a scholar's discussion or explorer's exhibition of some minute corner. We need to see where we are, both as to facts and tendencies. What can we believe as to the extent and value of the discoveries of past years? What must we believe as to their relation to the Old and New Testament? These are the questions Dr. Nicol has answered. We have verified his statements on some of the most critical matters, and find him both cautious and firm. We have followed the flow of his narrative from beginning to end with increasing attention and interest. The time may come, it may not be far off, when this volume will be ancient history. But it is history, and will always remain history; it will mark a stage in our knowledge of this great subject; and for the present it will at least be a fine opportunity for what Canon Butler calls 'holy self-indulgence' as we turn its fascinating pages.

THE ASCENT THROUGH CHRIST. By E. Griffith-Jones, B.A. (*Bowden*. Crown 8vo, pp. xxvi, 469. 7s. 6d.)

The title is probably a reminiscence of Drummond's 'Ascent of Man'; the sub-title is more luminous, 'A Study of the Doctrine of Redemption in the Light of the Theory of Evolution.' The first thing that occurs to one to say about the book itself is that both the author and the publisher have evidently resolved to do their best by it. If this is not a good book, I cannot write a good book, the author seems to say, I have put my best into this one; and the publisher seems to add, I too have done my best by it. So it is a book that at once arrests. We begin to read it prejudiced in its favour.

And it never loses that first impression. We see that the author is not the very highest authority either in Evolution or in the doctrine of Redemption. We see that he has not that catching felicity of style which carries everything before it. But all through we feel that we are in competent hands, and in touch with an extremely candid and considerate mind. Nay, we find at the close that Mr. Griffith-Jones has actually written the book that was waiting to be written on this subject. There is the sufficiency of authority, and there is the open-mindedness that were needed. There is also the unfaltering faith that was as much needed as anything. If Mr. Griffith-Jones had failed to show that Evolution preserved the doctrine of Redemption, we should not have been disturbed. We know it is true whatever comes of Evolution. But it is at least of intellectual interest to know that a modest theory of Evolution finds place for both the Fall and the Incarnation.

THE INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY. THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By George Barker Stevens, Ph.D. DD. (*T. & T. Clark*. 8vo, pp. 617. 12s.)

Whilst we wait for Professor Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament* there comes its companion volume. It is only a master of the subject that can gather the theology of either Testament into one lucid volume. Professor Stevens has had experience. His volumes on the Johannine and the Pauline theology have been, since their recent issue, the New Testament student's constant guide and friend. In this volume there are the same features of fulness, clear statement, sane judgment. There is also the same distinct sense of ownership. The judgments are sane, not because they express the average, but rather, as it seems to us, because the author has waited to find them work.

First, he carefully gathers the facts,—not passages merely, but also characteristics,—and then, stating his conclusions, he shows how they have worked themselves out in the lives of the men who reveal them, and in his own life also. The book seems to us therefore to be more than a safe guide to the New Testament theology, it is an impressive encouragement to newness of personal life.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. pursue the issue of their 'Small Books on Great Subjects.' The new volume contains five evangelical doctrinal sermons by the Rev. H. Arnold Thomas, M.A., under the title of *The Way of Life* (pp. 119, 1s. 6d.) The sermon on 'Saved by His Life' is full of correction for all unscriptural and mechanical methods of sanctification.

The Chair of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Aberdeen has in our time been occupied first by Professor Bain and then by Professor Minto. And now there comes from its present occupant, Professor Davidson, a manual of *Christian Ethics* (R. & R. Clark). It is a sign to this generation. First antagonism, then agnosticism, then a hearty desire to preach the gospel of the kingdom of God. And Professor Davidson has put his talents into the little book. It is full and scholarly.

Mr. Brooke and Mr. M'Lean are making steady progress with the great Cambridge Septuagint. Meantime Professor Swete has revised the third volume of his manual edition, and issued it anew (Cambridge, University Press, 7s. 6d). Besides the correction of errors that had crept into the edition of 1894, it contains the Greek fragments of the Book of Enoch and a revised text and apparatus of the Psalms of Solomon; the apparatus to Isaiah and Ezekiel has been compared with the facsimile of Q, and the more important readings of the Syriac text of 4 Maccabees have been added to the Appendix.

MY TOUR IN PALESTINE AND SYRIA. By F. H. Deverell. (*Eyre & Spottiswoode.* 8vo, pp. 269, with Map and Illustrations.)

A new eye sees ever new things in Palestine as well as everywhere else. Mr. Deverell has the seeing eye. The actual additions to our topographical facts are not great. How could they be after this time by a wayfarer? But the old facts and scenes are set in new lights, and there are texts of the Bible that have a little more of their riches quarried out of them. The book is well worth reading by even the experienced in Palestine travel, and it is certainly easy to read.

SABBATH NIGHTS AT PITCOONANS. By the Author of 'Sandy Scott's Bible Class.' (*Hodder & Stoughton.* Crown 8vo, pp. 95. 1s. 6d.)

'Sandy Scott' preaches the gospel as he has learned it—in broad Scotch. Some there are to whom the good Samaritan speaking Aberdeenshire (or the like) is either comical or irreverent. But no doubt the good Samaritan spoke the vernacular of his day, and so it is merely a matter of translation. And no one will deny the reality, or even the pathos of these Bible-class conversations.

TRUE LIMITS OF RITUAL IN THE CHURCH. Edited by the Rev. Robert Linklater, D.D. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. xvi, 250. 5s.)

Dr. Linklater has found seven High Churchmen, and himself the eighth, to write an eirenicon. They are pronounced High Churchmen all. They do not refuse to write an eirenicon. But they know what an eirenicon means. The wolf and the lamb must lie down together, but the only method of accomplishing it is for the lamb to lie down inside the wolf, and they even make their invitation with a growl. The true limits of ritual are of course the boards of the Prayer Book. But the Prayer Book is susceptible of the most wonderful wealth of interpretation. Our eirenicon is that you must interpret it in our way or you are anathema.

Dr. Linklater is disappointed of one of his papers, so he writes the introductory essay himself. He first disposes of the difficulty 'which fair English minds must necessarily experience, in accounting for the united and sustained opposition at the present moment, of all sorts and conditions of men against the High Church clergy of the Church of England.' And he disposes of it easily. The High Church clergy are the followers of the Lord, all the rest are the 'world.' 'We remember certain utterances of our Divine Lord and Master by which He prepared His disciples for the opposition of the world, and warned them that they must expect to be treated as the world

treated Him.' That settles the matter at once and satisfactorily.

And then Mr. Wylde of Leeds enters 'A Plea for Reasonableness,' and shows how reasonable is even the veneration of the Cross, of which one part consists in worshippers 'kneeling before the representation of our Crucified Lord, and kissing the feet of the figure.'

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF BISHOPS IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By the Rev. A. T. Wirgman, D.D., D.C.L. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. 292. 6s.)

Provost Wirgman has worked through the history of the Church from the Apostolic Age to the Council of Chalcedon in 451 for the purpose of discovering the position and authority of the Bishop. That has been his sole search, and he has not missed many particulars. The book is thererefore valuable, apart from its conclusions, for the fulness of its information. It is a text-book on this great vexed matter, with the judicious use of which any student may reach his own conclusions. But Dr. Wirgman's conclusions are also a weighty portion. He is transparently honest. He is severely scientific. No doubt the intellectual prepossession is there in spite of him; but it is not consciously there. And then it may always be discounted, the materials themselves being provided.

INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN. By the Rev. Cresswell Strange, M.A. *Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. xx, 331. 6s.)

It is painful to think that with all our progress in biblical interpretation, one still opens a new book on the Apocalypse with misgiving. For still is it the happy hunting ground of the bitter sectary or the visionary saint, though he has been driven out of every other Scripture. But then, when the book is found to be credible, the relief is very pleasant. Mr. Strange is credible. He is modern and restrained. He is full of instruction and help. If the average student would read this book first and then the Apocalypse itself, passing all other introductions by, he would receive a grounding in the meaning of this marvellous writing that would stand him in good stead for ever. The scholarship is as accurate as the illustration is felicitous.

UNIVERSITY AND OTHER SERMONS. By H. M. Butler, D.D., LL.D. (Cambridge: *Macmillan & Bowes.* Crown 8vo, pp. 350. 5s. net.)

We are all familiar with the phrase, 'an enlightened self-interest,' and we are not very fond of it. But what shall we make of the expression, 'a holy self-indulgence'? Dr. Butler recommends it to the modern preacher. And what he means is, that the modern preacher should let his desires go out to the reading of history and biography, and then preach what he has read. Dr. Butler seems to think it is a holy penance to read the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Psalms, and preach them to the people. It is indulgence to read the life of Francis Xavier or the story of Waterloo. Let it be preached as it is read, he says; it will then become a *holy* indulgence. Whereupon, says Dr. Butler, 'he will be the better for it himself, and his people will share the benefit. In the noble phrase of Robert Hall, he will have enlarged their intercourse with heaven.' Dr. Butler himself preaches so. The first half of the book is occupied with simple discourses on Scripture themes; the second, with discourses on historical persons and events. We find the Funeral of President Garfield, the Battle of Waterloo, and Balaclava Day.

The third volume of the 'Eversley' *Shakespeare* is out. It contains 'Much Ado,' 'All's Well,' 'Measure for Measure, and 'Troilus and Cressida.' The Introductions are not historical only, there is also exposition of structure and character; but all is short as short can be. The plays make up the volume.

The third volume of Dr. Joseph Parker's *Studies in Texts* has been published by Mr. Horace Marshall. It contains ten long sermons which bristle with sharp points, many prayers, a narrative of the history of the Institute of Homiletics, and eighty pages of 'Phases of Texts,' which are sermons either in their first or second childhood, we cannot tell which. But there is in the volume from first to last at least a year's great discourses, if you can draw them out of it.

Messrs. Marshall Brothers are the publishers of a promising book for preachers by the Rev. Robert Tuck, B.A., entitled *The Hour before Holy Communion.* It contains collects, hymns, and meditations. They also issue a cheaper edition of Fox's *Victory through the Name.*

Messrs. Methuen are running so many series at present that one has to walk warily not to get lost among them. One of the series is 'The Library of Devotion,' and the first volume of it we have seen is Keble's *Lyra Innocentium*, edited by Professor Walter Lock—the greatest of Keble editors. It is a taking little volume; its paper just a little too thin and transparent; its editing irreproachable.

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By C. Gore, M.A., D.D. (*Murray.* Crown 8vo, pp. 326. 3s. 6d.)

Canon Gore has caught the ear of the religious reading world, and he is determined to use his opportunity. A nobler ambition than the ambition to make known the Epistles of St. Paul to this busy generation a man could scarcely have. This generation is impatient of St. Paul. It neglects him, and even disowns him, and no wonder that things are not going well with this generation. Canon Gore is actually bringing it back to St. Paul. And although his St. Paul is not wholly yours or mine, it is a great achievement and a great gain. The present volume is the first half of *Romans*. It is most invigorating reading.

Messrs. Nisbet have just put out a new edition of Mr. Reid Howatt's *The Children's Pew*, one of the few classical books of children's sermons, at the very reasonable price of half a crown.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTER. By the Rev. James Robertson, D.D. (*Oliphant.* Crown 8vo, pp. 184. 3s. 6d.)

There is no subject on which so many good books are written as on Preaching. That is because we have not yet recognized its greatness. We do not reckon it great enough to endow Preaching Chairs in all our Colleges. So we appoint lecturers. When they have delivered their course they can publish, for the lectures will not be required again. And readers are at once found for every new volume as it comes. These volumes differ, but they are all read. They differ in aim as well as in execution. Dr. Robertson's aim is characteristically modest. He is a man with experience behind him; he would pass it over to younger men, that they may do less harm than young preachers generally do, and begin sooner to do good. It is no volume of systematic homiletic therefore. It is a fine volume of systematic good sense. There are some who read all the books on Preaching that are published, there are some who select the best. This is one to be selected.

THE CULTURE OF CHRISTIAN MANHOOD. Edited by W. H. Sallmon. (*Oliphant.* Crown 8vo, pp. 309. 3s. 6d.)

The sixteen sermons in this volume were preached in the College Chapel of Yale University by sixteen of the best known preachers of America. They are addressed to young men. The young men are taken to be intelligent and in earnest. The earnestness is believed to be not far from the kingdom of God. And the way of entrance as well as the life within are described with clearness of thought and warmth of personal attachment. These sermons are as near an approach as one will find to the 'pattern in the mount' of sermons to young men.

AMONG THE WILD NGONI. By W. A. Elmslie, F.R.G.S. (*Oliphant.* Crown 8vo, pp. 319. 3s. 6d.)

Dr. Elmslie has written a simply fascinating book. The traveller with no interest in Christian missions, the Christian with no interest in travel, both will find it fascinating. And it is true. It is strictly true, and under rather than over drawn. For Dr. Elmslie is a Christian himself with a Christian conscience. It would have been easy to have made it a much more pretentious book, and then it would probably have had a greater circulation. But it is well done, and full of accurate graphic illustrations.

A third volume has been issued by Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier of Dr. Whyte's *Bible Characters* (crown 8vo, pp. 241, 3s. 6d.). The characters are taken as before in the order in which they lie in the Bible. The first is Ahithophel, the last Nehemiah. And, as before, every study is an arrest, both of the 'character' and of the reader. For a half-hour or more, Ahithophel is held there, and the very soul of him is turned out till you can see the motives that are written across it. It is a terrible time for Ahithophel. And it is no less terrible for you. For Ahithophel's soul becomes yours. It is your motives and your soul the congregation is seeing and reading.

The Boys' Brigade is associated in many minds with the name of Mr. Herbert Reid. If Mr.

Reid has not the literary skill of the late Professor Drummond, he has more knowledge. The book which he has just published—*Private James Fyffe* (Oliphant, 1s. 6d.)—is not a connected story, but a series of incidents. It owes its interest to the close contact it always keeps with the character and capacity of the average Brigade boy. Mr. Reid hears the Saviour say, 'Suffer the growing boy to come unto Me, and encourage him with all your might.'

In *Foretokens of Immortality*, by Newell Dwight Hillis, which Messrs. Oliphant have also published, there are many striking ideas (though they are clothed in somewhat gorgeous array of language). To those who drop upon 'the hour when the immortal hope burns low in the heart,' the little book will carry a message.

LETTERS FROM A MYSTIC OF THE PRESENT DAY. By Rowland W. Corbet, M.A. (*Stock*. Crown 8vo, pp. xx, 211.)

We have often wished we could fall in with a genuine mystic of the present day, just as we are ready to enjoy any new and sinless sensation. And he has come. At least we find in Mr. Corbet's letters the impenetrable darkness which is said to be inseparable from genuine mysticism. And since we discover the most luminous commonplaces in other pages, we are ready to admit that the darkness is in our own minds, as all true mystics affirm. Again we find in Mr. Corbet's letters the most glaring heterodoxy that could be transferred to paper. For instance, there is no sin. What seems so, is ignorance. Jesus said, 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins have been done away.' He called the man 'son,' for 'He is speaking to him as to a child of God, and tells him, without any solicitation on his part, an eternal fact, viz. that his sins have no existence as in the mind or eye of God.' And the Lamb of God came to take away—sin? no, but the mistake of thinking that God ever reckoned sin against any one of us. Now, once more, we submit that the heresy is ours. For in one of the letters we read: 'I had a great happiness the other day. A friend, who was led at one time to estimate me as a heretic, wrote: "The matter which had so troubled me has burst upon me in clear, bright vision, and all is transfigured in its redeeming light."' So we have found our modern mystic, and found him most piquant, though not progressive, reading.

There is no work on earth so happy as foreign mission work when it is successful, the good done is so unmistakable and so unmixed. Miss Sophia Cooke spent forty-two years doing mission work in Singapore; it was uninterruptedly successful, and she was one of the happiest women on earth. The narrative which Mr. Elliot Stock has published (*Sophia Cooke*, by E. A. Walker) has just one fault, it is too short. Still, the best work has least to say of itself.

Mr. Frank Mundell has published through the Sunday School Union a small volume of sea stories—*Stories of Sea Adventure* is its title—which the younger members of the Sunday School will take to greedily and find good in.

A GEM OF ORTHODOXY. By S. L. Marsden. (*Fisher Unwin*. Crown 8vo, pp. 360. 6s.)

If orthodoxy is the belief of the greater number, it has a certain presumption on its side. Mr. Marsden recognizes that. He therefore takes great pains to show where orthodoxy went wrong, and why. He spends half his book on that. Then he comes to the point. The point is in these words of St. Paul, 'God was in Christ.' Orthodoxy has said, 'God was Christ,' or at least 'Christ was God,' which Mr. Marsden counts to be practically the same thing. St. Paul said, 'God was *in* Christ.' And so Mr. Marsden holds that all the doctrine of Christ's deity is a mistake. God was in Christ as He is in you and me (in less measure, no doubt); and if Christ was God, then are we all Gods, or ought to be. It is a book to be read. It is a sign of the times. This is no public-park orator, but a refined special pleader, well equipped with historical facts and well fitted to turn them to quiet controversial account. This is the latest form of denial that Jesus is the Son of God. Surely the end is near.

The sixth volume of the English translation of Harnack's *History of Dogma* has been published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate. Its translator is the Rev. W. M'Gilchrist, B.D., and he seems to have done his work—it is as difficult a bit as any—with great care and skill. Another volume completes the translation.

Woman's Rights.

Professor I. J. Peritz, of Syracuse University, N.Y., has reprinted from the *Journal of Biblical Literature* an exceedingly interesting essay on 'Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult,' and thus has furnished a fresh illustration of the truth that much work remains to be done in studying themes which were supposed to be exhausted. His essay is a direct attack on the view associated with such distinguished names as Stade, Schwally, Nowack, and Benzinger, that woman was disqualified by her sex from performing the duties of the religious cult among the Hebrews. Benzinger has asserted roundly that 'woman was not capable of practising the cult.' Stade traces the Hebrew law of inheritance to woman's inability to perform the duties connected with ancestor worship.

Professor Peritz deals first with woman's position in other Semitic peoples, showing that amongst pre-Islamite Arabs, Assyrians, Babylonians, Phœnicians, etc., there were female divinities, female devotees, and female cultic officials. If these religions recognized female deities they could scarcely taboo female worshippers. Nor did they. Women joined in the two chief acts of Arabian worship, the 'stroking,' and the act of encircling the sacred stone. Such names of women as 'Handmaid of Melkart,' implying on the part of its bearer the worship of Melkart, are found on the Carthaginian inscriptions. Again, many women in the time prior to Islam occupied the office of *Kâhin*, 'which corresponded very closely to that of the early Hebrew *Kôhen*.' In Babylonia and Phœnicia there were priestesses and prophetesses. The Old Testament, also, gives only too many instances of the eagerness with which Hebrew women cultivated foreign rites, the worship of Ishtar (Jer 7^{18} 44^{15}) and of Tammuz (Ezk 8^{14}): see also 1 K 15^{13}, 2 K 23^{7}, etc.

If there was nothing to prevent a woman from taking part, and even a prominent part, in the religious services of the related races, it is not likely that they were shut out by the Hebrews. And on this point there is much direct evidence.

The Old Testament makes it plain that women were accustomed to be present at religious gatherings, to share in the sacrificial meals, nay, to share in the sacrificial act. Female victims were allowed, and if this statement does not apply to the later law of firstlings, there is good reason for believing that the exclusive requirement of firstling *males* has been interpolated into the earlier legislation.[1] Women participated in those mourning customs, which have been supposed to indicate a primitive ancestor worship.[2] They had access to the teraphim; they gave oracular replies to inquirers; they practised necromancy. There were prophetesses; there were female ministrants at the sanctuary (Ex 38^{8}, 1 S 2^{22}); there were women singers who exercised their gifts in public worship: Miriam led the female choir in their grateful acknowledgment of God's mercy; the singing-women of Neh 7^{67} returned to Jerusalem to brighten the services of the sanctuary; Judith (15^{12}–16^{7}), in an act of public worship, 'went before all the people in the dance . . . and began to sing this thanksgiving.'

The objections and seeming exceptions are not left unnoticed in this strong, yet temperate, *brochure*, and one can only echo the hope expressed by its author, 'at some future time, as a second part of the subject, to treat fully of the causes of woman's later inferior position in the cult, and her final, apparently entire, exclusion from it.' It is saddening to be present in a Mohammedan mosque at the Friday prayers and note how Islam has driven out the wives and mothers. But it is equally grievous, and we should like to be better informed how it came about, that Jews in their daily morning service say, 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast not made me a woman.' Happily the women are more pious than we, and there is a deeper religiousness in their word: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast made me according to Thy will.'

John Taylor.

The Vicarage, Winchcombe.

[1] Dr. Peritz's discussion of the passages in question, Ex $13^{2.\ 12.\ 13}$ 22^{28} $34^{19.\ 20}$, Dt 15^{19}, is an excellent piece of criticism. The position of זָכָר, and the generally admitted fact that it is one of P's words, are surely decisive.

[2] It would not be easy to rebut Stade's conclusion that the customs of mourning prove that the Hebrews, at one stage of their history, worshipped the dead. But Peritz has shown that the law which limits inheritance to the male line, is not due to that worship, but to the fact that in primitive Semitic society the active members of society were alone deemed worthy to be heirs: 'None can be heirs who do not take part in battle, drive booty, and protect property.'

An Archaeological Commentary on Genesis.

By Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Oxford.

XLII. 6. *Shallîṭ*, 'governor,' is Aramaic and Assyrian rather than Hebrew; but we appear to have the word in Salatis, the name of the first Hyksos Pharaoh. The attitude of 'smelling the earth,' as the Egyptians called it, is frequently depicted on the monuments, and had to be adopted by the inferior when ushered into the presence of his superiors.

11. *Kênîm*, 'true men,' is parallel to *arad kitti*, 'faithful servant,' the expression used by the writers of the Tel el-Amarna tablets when protesting their loyalty to the Pharaoh.

15. 'By the life of the king,' or of 'Pharaoh,' was a common Egyptian oath, and *ânkh*, 'life,' accordingly, also means 'to swear.'

23. The interpreter was an old institution in Egypt. One of the high officials of the court was 'the first interpreter of his majesty the king,' and Dusratta, king of Mitanni, in one of his letters in the Tel el-Amarna collection, speaks of Khanê the Egyptian 'dragoman' (*targumannu*). In a lexical tablet the Sumerian *pal* is explained by the Assyrian *turgumannu*, 'interpreter.'

26. It is noteworthy that only asses and not camels are laden with the sacks of corn (*kĕlê*, different from the *saq*, or 'bag,' into which the provender and the silver were put). This is in accordance with the testimony of the pictures on the Egyptian monuments. So in the tomb of Khnumhotep, at Beni-Hassan, the thirty-seven Asiatics, with their Sheikh Abisha, who brought stibium to Usertesen II. of the twelfth dynasty, are represented as accompanied only by asses.

27. The *mâlôn*, or 'rest-house,' was similar to those established by Thothmes III. in Canaan, of which the Pharaoh says in his annals that 'the rest-houses were provided with every kind of provision as their tax for each year required.'

30. The expression 'the man' here and in xliii. 3, 6, 14, reminds us that the Egyptian called himself *romi*, 'man,' the people of Egypt being the *romet*, or 'men.'

XLIII. 11. Present is here *minkhâh*, 'meal-offering'; cp. the Egyptian *hotep*, 'offering to the gods of bread and fruit,' as well as 'reconciliation by means of a gift.'

23. Compare the introduction of the letters from brother sovereigns in the Tel el-Amarna collection: 'Unto me is peace; unto thee, thy country, thy wives, thy children, thy officers, thy horses and thy chariots, may there ever be peace!'

27. Mr. Tomkins compares the phrases in Egyptian letters of the nineteenth dynasty: 'I am very well off; I am alive'; 'Setemua is in good plight; he lives,' and adds that to an Egyptian who looked forward to a happy life beyond the grave, to be alive and to be well off were not necessarily the same thing.

28. Literally 'there is peace to thy servant our father,' as in the Tel el-Amarna letters.

32. The Asiatic was accounted by the Egyptians 'impure.'

34. Pictures and inscriptions show that the Egyptians were given to excess in wine and beer.

XLIV. 2. The silver cup had a special name in Egyptian, *yenra*.

4. If Joseph was the vizier of a Hyksos Pharaoh, the 'city' would have been either Zoan or Avaris, on the Asiatic frontier. The distance to Palestine was, therefore, not great.

5. The use of divining cups lasted in Egypt down to the days of Iamblichus (iii. 14). What they were like we may gather from the bowls found by Layard in Babylonia, the inner surfaces of which are covered with exorcisms against evil spirits. Magical names and words were inscribed upon them, and prevented any evil happening to him who drank out of them. Even pronouncing certain magical words over an object was sufficient to convert it into an amulet.

15. Egyptian papyri contain many indications of a belief in the power of magic to discover secrets, such as thefts and other crimes.

XLV. 8. There may be an allusion to the class of Egyptian priests called 'divine fathers,' and in *âdôn*, 'lord,' to the Egyptian word *adon*, 'agent' or 'representative.'

10. The excavations of Dr. Naville in 1884 at Saft-el-Henneh showed that here was the site of Qesem or Qos, called Pha-kussa in Greek geography, the capital of the Arabian nome. As Goshen is written Geshem in the Septuagint, the land of Goshen will have corresponded with the Arabian nome. It thus comprised the modern Wadi Tumilât, south of Zoan, along the line of the Freshwater Canal. It is bounded on the east by Tel el-Maskhuta, the ancient Pa-Tum or Pithom, near Ismailiyeh, and on the west by Belbês and Zagazig. The name of the 'Arabian nome' indicates its proximity to the desert as well as the nature of its population. Meneptah II. says of Pa-Bailos (the modern Belbês), 'the country around was not cultivated, but left as pasture for cattle because of the strangers, having been abandoned since the times of old.' As Meneptah II. was the son and successor of Ramses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression, 'the strangers' referred to may well have been the Israelites. A despatch to the same king, dated in his eighth year, states that certain Shasu or Bedawin, from Edom, had been allowed to pass the Khetam, or Fortress, of Meneptah-Hotephirma, in the district of Succoth (Thuku), and make their way to the lakes of the city of Pithom, in the district of Succoth, 'in order to feed themselves and their herds on the possessions of Pharaoh.' The advantage of settling the family of Jacob in Goshen was threefold: it was near Zoan, the Hyksos capital; while forming part of Egypt, it was nevertheless not inhabited by the Egyptians themselves, and it was better suited to the needs of the nomad Asiatics and their herds and cattle than any other part of the country.

11. If the first part of Joseph's Egyptian name is *Zaf*, 'nourisher,' there may be an allusion to it here.

19. It was during the Hyksos period that waggons and horses were introduced into Egypt. Like the chariot (*merkobt*, Canaanitish *merkâbâh*), the waggon (*âgolt*, Can. *'agâlâh*) was borrowed from Canaan, as is shown by its name.

The Temptation of Christ.

By the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, B.A., B.D., Montrose.

III.

The conclusion of our second inquiry into the literary character of the communication made by Jesus to His followers regarding His temptation is briefly that the narratives need not be taken literally, but may be, nay, must be, interpreted symbolically. Where can we look for certain guidance in our next inquiry into the significance of each of the three temptations? If the narrative is throughout symbolical, it will not itself at once suggest the facts figuratively presented; but must be made intelligible by the entire historical situation of Jesus, at the time when the temptation took place. It came just after the baptism in Jordan, when, by the descent of the Spirit, Jesus was endowed with supernatural powers for His Messianic ministry, and by the voice from heaven was confirmed in His consciousness of filial relation to God. It was the certainty of this filial relation to God, and the possession of powers hitherto unexercised, that formed the moral situation of Jesus when He withdrew from Jordan to the wilderness. The certainty of a unique relation to God suggested various uses of the supernatural powers, which at first sight did not appear inappropriate or inconsistent. The moral insight and vigour of Jesus appeared in the stripping off of the disguises, and the discovery of the evil concealed in each suggestion. The temptation was a test of moral insight as well as a trial of moral vigour. The exact significance which we give to each separate temptation depends, however, on the aspect of the unique relation to God, which we emphasize, as presumably the more prominent for the mind of Jesus, either the personal, or the official. Was His filial relation to God viewed by Jesus as a personal privilege, or as an official function? Without at this stage deciding which of the two views is more probable, let us see what significance the temptations assume in each case.

1. Let us assume that Jesus thought of His

filial relation to God as personal privilege, then the temptations may be severally understood somewhat as follows:—In the first temptation it was suggested to Him to use His powers as a proof of His peculiar position in self-indulgence, the satisfaction of His own desires, the relief of His own wants. In the second, self-protection in all circumstances of difficulty and danger by an appeal to God on the ground of His unique relation appeared as a not unreasonable, and a not immodest demand upon God. In the third, self-advancement among men insinuated itself as a not extravagant ambition for one who knew Himself so highly favoured and so richly endowed by God. In each of these suggestions Jesus saw a temptation to distrust in and disobedience to God. What each of these suggestions, innocent as at first sight they might appear, involved was a refusal on His part to submit to the limitations of the Incarnation of the Son of God. Had Jesus met all His bodily wants, saved Himself from all His earthly dangers, and furthered all His worldly aims by use of the powers given to Him as Son of God, that He might be the Saviour of men, then assuredly the Incarnation would have been semblance and not reality. The habitual exercise of divine prerogatives in His personal experience as distinguished from His official activity would have turned His humanity into a mere pretence. How meaningless and false would have been a manhood in which all human conditions were being constantly transcended. Whether powers so abused would not have been at last forfeited is a speculative problem about which we need not concern ourselves, as the moral problem was solved by Jesus in His unhesitating acceptance of human limitations, and His unflinching rejection of all exclusive privilege.

Such would seem to be the significance of the temptations on the assumption that the filial relation to God presented itself to Jesus as a personal privilege; but it may be questioned whether this assumption is justified. It may be doubted with reason whether Christian theology in its anxiety to accumulate proofs of the divinity of Jesus has done justice to the consciousness of Jesus. It usually speaks of Christ's claims; it is likely that Jesus thought most of His duties. His Sonship presented itself to Him, 'the meek and the lowly in heart,' 'whose meat and drink it was to do His Father's will,' not as a right to be asserted, but as a duty to be discharged. The dependence upon God that He felt, the obedience to God that He owed, and the communion with God that He ever sought—these had the first place in His consciousness, not His privileges and prerogatives. Accordingly, it is probable that the temptations related to the duties of His calling rather than to the rights of His person.

2. We turn now to the more probable aspect of the temptations; they related to His work as Messiah. But in this relation an alternative again presents itself. The temptations may have referred to isolated supernatural acts as means of establishing the Messianic kingdom, or to distinctive permanent features of it. In the first case, the question to be settled by Jesus was, How is the kingdom to come? in the second case, What is the kingdom to be? It may be said that the two questions are at bottom indistinguishable and inseparable. The character of the kingdom must depend on the means taken for its establishment. That is undoubtedly a moral certainty; but we must not forget that men are always hiding this certainty from themselves. It is thought possible to gain worthy ends by unworthy means, to purify results from the moral defect of their causes. The possibility of so divorcing means and ends, causes and results, is very generally assumed. This assumption that it was possible for Him to establish an ethical and spiritual kingdom by secular means might have presented itself to Jesus as a temptation. Later events in His ministry show that this temptation was again and again forced upon Him. Each of the three temptations in the wilderness can be illustrated by an incident in His life. The multitude whom He had fed in the wilderness tried to seize Him and make Him a king. His disciples were ever expecting the kingdom to be established. The Galileans who had come up to the feast welcomed Him with royal honours. On the last occasion He yielded to the wishes of the people, because He knew that the attempt to make Him king would and could go no further, but on the first occasion He withstood the clamour, and so estranged many of His followers. Thus He was really tempted to seek an earthly kingship, as a means of bringing to earth the kingdom of God. That was the third temptation in the wilderness. Again, the multitudes once fed wanted to be fed again, and had to be driven away with scathing

rebuke. This surely shows what was meant by the first temptation. Let Him use His powers to meet bodily needs, and many will be sure to follow Him. When His enemies bade Him work a sign from heaven that they might believe, and He might thus secure their allegiance, He was tempted to use His power to compel faith in His mission. In a very vivid pictorial form this temptation appears in the demand of the tempter that He should cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. In each case an unworthy means for securing a worthy end is suggested. But it seems to me that at the beginning of His work Jesus' mind would be busy with not simply the means, but even the ends of the work, and that accordingly we get a truer view of the temptations by viewing them in relation to the nature of the Messianic kingdom.

3. It may be thought that Jesus came to Jordan to be baptized by John with a clear and firm idea of the nature of the kingdom, that in the quietness and loneliness of Nazareth He had thought out the whole plan of His ministry, and that accordingly it was impossible that He should in the wilderness be in any doubt about what His kingdom was to be. But this assumption may be challenged. It divorces Jesus' inner experience from His outward history; it deprives the baptism in Jordan, the descent of the Spirit, and the voice from heaven of their distinctive significance as the signs of a moral and spiritual crisis in the inmost life of Jesus; and it reduces the temptation in the wilderness, about which Jesus thought it needful and fit to make a communication to His disciples, to secondary importance as compared with certain experiences in Nazareth, about which no report is given to us. It seems more probable that in the wilderness the plan of the ministry was first fixed. We have no evidence of how far the development of Jesus' consciousness of Sonship and Messiahship had gone when he left Nazareth; that it had not reached the complete and final stage, as is often assumed, seems probable, if we do justice to the strain and stress of the situation in which Jesus found Himself. The inward change that accompanied the outward signs raised new questions, brought strange surprises, and so demanded fresh decisions. The inward waits upon the outward, experience upon history. It would have been quite unnatural for Jesus to make plans for a work to which He had not yet been called for which He had not yet been endowed with the needful gifts. When the call came, when the gifts were bestowed, then the plans were formed. Doubtless Jesus had reached perfection and maturity of personal character prior to His baptism, but His consciousness of His message and mission became distinct and certain only after the conflict in the desert. Assuming, then, that Jesus was learning what His kingdom was to be, let us see what each of the three temptations may mean. There can be no kingdom without a country. A land and a people must go together to form a realm; and the health and happiness of the people, and so the greatness of the kingdom, depend on the land. That the land of God's promise to Abraham must be the seat of the kingdom of the seed of David, was beyond question; but the land was in many parts barren, dry and waste wilderness. Must not the wilderness be changed into a garden for the health and happiness of the people and the greatness of the kingdom? 'Command that these stones become bread.' As Messiah use your power to set the people in a goodly and fair land. But, again, is not Jerusalem the city which God has chosen for Himself, and the temple His own dwelling-place? and yet the heathen tread the streets of the town, and even the outer court of the temple, and a Roman fort overlooks its most holy places. Surely the Messiah with His devoted followers may, to cleanse town and holy place from defilement, hurl themselves in bold and brave defiance against the heathen hosts, sure that God will keep His own safe in all danger. 'Cast Thyself down.' Desperate as may seem the attempt to drive out the Romans, make it, trusting in God. But has not God promised that He will give to the Messiah 'the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession'? Claim the fulfilment of the promise. Having driven out the Romans from Jerusalem and Palestine, lead thine armies against theirs, until the world-wide rule of Rome totter to its fall, and then become heir of its glory. 'All shall be Thine,' that was the evil suggestion, 'if Thou wilt bow down and worship me,' that was the concealed condition of the promise which Jesus' moral insight at once detected. Make thy kingdom temporally happy, politically free, imperially great—these were the temptations. How did they form themselves in the mind, and force themselves on the will of Jesus?—that is our next inquiry.

Contributions and Comments.

On the Address of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Professor Th. Zahn, in the second volume of his *Introduction to the New Testament*, where he discusses the various suppositions brought forward on the question where we have to seek the first readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews, declares it for the most probable that the Epistle was destined for some Jewish Christians in Italy, more especially in *Rome*. Among the reasons for this supposition he mentions: the readers must have lived in a great town, where there was more than one Christian congregation. For some of their circle began to leave the congregation, to which they belonged properly, not to quit Christianity altogether or to join the Jewish synagogue, but to seek their edification in some other Christian congregation of the same town (10^{25}). 'The addressees form,' he concludes, 'a smaller circle of old Christians in the midst of a great town, where there were more such congregations' (p. 147). This is confirmed, Professor Zahn thinks, by the injunction to greet *all* them that have the rule and *all* the saints (13^{24}). The readers have, beside the assembly of their own (10^{28}), perhaps also *rulers* for themselves (13^{17}); but, on the other hand, they form part of the '*Gesamtgemeinde*' (central parish), and the fate of the latter was also their fate (6^{10} 10^{32} 13^{7}). Zahn declares not to know, where similar relations might have subsisted in the first century, if not in Rome, where already Paul distinguishes several groups of Christian gatherings (Ro $16^{3\text{-}13}$, beside the house-congregation of Aquila, a second and a third group, vv.$^{14.\ 15}$). Whether one of them be identical with the circle to which the Epistle to the Hebrews is addressed, perhaps the one mentioned in Ro 16^{14}, or whether the grouping had been changed in the meanwhile, and how the relations of the several ἐπισυναγωγαί to the central parish of Rome were regulated, Professor Zahn confesses not to know.

Now it strikes me that just for Rome a συναγωγὴ Ἑβραίων is mentioned, in two inscriptions, *beside* the six or seven synagogues which we know from other inscriptions. We hear of a συναγωγὴ Αὐγουστησίων and a συναγωγὴ Ἀγριππησίων (cf. Ph 4^{22} οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας); of Καμπήσιοι and Σιβουρήσιοι, which have their names from the quarters where they lived, the *Campus Martius* and the *Subura*; of a συναγωγὴ Ἐλαίας; finally, we read in *Corpus Inscr. Graec.* No. 9909, Γαδία πατρὸς συναγωγῆς Αἰβρέων, and in another inscription, πατρὸς τῶν Ἑβρέων Γαδία. See Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, ii. 517 (third edition, iii. 46) and Zahn himself in the first volume of his *Introduction*, p. 33. Zahn refers to this passage in the second volume (p. 113), where he discusses the meaning of the word Ἑβραῖοι, but not where he tries to prove that our Epistle was addressed to such a congregation of *Rome*. Whether this combination did not occur to him or whether he will decline it as too fanciful, yet it seems to deserve mentioning; for the heading 'to the Hebrews' or rather 'to Hebrews' is stranger than we generally recognize, because we are accustomed to it; and to find a συναγωγὴ Αἰβρέων just at the place where Zahn seeks the readers of this letter, is perhaps more than accidental.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

'He hath set the world in their heart' (Eccles. iii. 11).

We shall soon see what Mr. T. Tyler is able to make of the fascinating enigma which forms the heading of this note. Siegfried, the latest commentator, renders גַּם אֶת־הָעֹלָם נָתַן בְּלִבָּם, 'also he has laid the future in their hearts,' *i.e.* he has given their minds an impulse to search out the obscurities of the future. Dalman, in his invaluable work, *Die Worte Jesu*, Bd. i. (1898) p. 134, thinks that עֹלָם here means 'die unabsehbare Weltzeit,' the period during which the world has existed, or at least been inhabited by man, which is apparently of an illimitable duration. I suppose at least that this is Dalman's meaning. It is perhaps a little more plausible than Siegfried's, but so far as my own exegetical judgment goes, only just possible, and not in the least probable. For other interpretations see Delitzsch's commentary, and cf. my own *Job and Solomon* (p. 210), where

these interpretations are considered. Neither 'future' nor 'world' nor 'eternity' seems to be admissible. The last of these is favoured by Delitzsch; compare Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ii. 146–148—

> Sad cure! for who would lose,
> Though full of pain, this intellectual being,
> *These thoughts that wander through eternity.*

I had myself been attracted by another sense. 'Man has been endowed with the faculty of understanding this kaleidoscopic world, with the drawback that he cannot possibly embrace it all in one view,' or, in Lord Bacon's words, 'God has framed the mind like a glass, capable of the image of the universe, and desirous to receive it, as the eye to receive the light' (*Advancement of Learning*). Bickell, in 1886, sought to combine these two meanings, 'The universe, and also the whole of eternity, he has placed,' etc. This implies the reading, אֶת־הַכֹּל גַּם אֶת־הָעֹלָם. I will call this Bickell[2]. In 1884 he took a different view, reading גַּם לְבַקֵּשׁ אֶת־כָּל־הֶעֱלֵם 'also to search out all that is hidden,' etc.; I call this Bickell[1]. Bickell[1] is noticed by Siegfried, but not Bickell[2]. Both views are ingenious, but bolder than the occasion demands; moreover הֶעֱלֵם should of course be הֶנְעֱלֵם. Before we attempt a new solution, we must look at the LXX. In v.[10] B has *σὺν πάντα* ('all' not in Heb.); in v.[11] B and C have *σύμπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα*; and A only *σὺν τὸν αἰῶνα*. Euringer (*Der Masorahtext des Koheleth*, 1890, p. 56) presumes that *παντα* in v.[11] is not original. I do not feel sure of that. The insertion and omission of *παντα* were equally easy; exegesis must decide. My impression is that the repetition of כל is pathetic and forcible. But this is not the main point. V.[11] appears to me to fall into two parts. One part refers to vv.[1-8], and states that, if you take things with regard to their 'time,' all have a becomingness (יפה) of their own. The other refers to v.[10], and states that the truth spoken of is ordained by God (note גַּם). הָעֹלָם must, I think, be corrected הָעִנְיָן (cf. v.[10]), and it almost requires a prefixed כָּל־. In v.[10], too, 'all the truth' is more forcible than merely 'the truth.' The palæographical changes supposed are of the easiest. The sense becomes 'all things are beautiful in their time'; even 'all the travail' (את־כל־העניין) of the student, which God Himself suggested to his mind, though this 'travail' cannot reach its desired end in full.

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

Isaiah xlv. 12.

Meni, 'that number.'

The first part of this verse has received satisfactory explanation in the identification of 'that troop' with Gad, a divinity often found in the Greek inscriptions of the Hauran. This has lent great support to the supposition that 'that number' should be also a divine name. In the *Proceedings of Soc. Bibl. Arch.* I call attention to the existence of a god (or goddess?) Ma-a-ni known to us from the cuneiform inscriptions. Mr. F. C. H. Küchler, of Marburg, has pointed out to me the importance of this identification.

The name occurs in a list of slaves (?) (K. 4718 in the British Museum), where we have in succession, Puṭi-Ḫûrû, Ḫûru, Ṣumašše, . . . Puṭi-Mâni and Puṭi-Šeri. As the name Puṭi-ili shows, we may expect Hûrû, Mâni, and Šeri to be divine names. These names have an Egyptian look about them; but I cannot now discuss them. I should be glad to hear from anyone who has found proof of a god Mâni, or could settle the nationality of the above slaves.

C. H. W. Johns.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

Hittite Decipherment.

I.

That for the Cilician (or Cappadocian) royal title x-y-z-x (+ nominative ending -s or -š) there are still other possibilities than *Syennesis*, is shown, apart from my tentative reading *vi-a-l-vi-* (*πάλμυς*, *Βαλβι-*), likewise by the name of the Cappadocian Hercules handed down by Eusebius, namely, *Desandas* (even Jensen would admit his Syennesis to have been the title of a god as well as a king). This *Desandas* also I put forward of course only as a possibility, but may take the opportunity to point out that, adopting it, and supposing Jensen has rightly deduced the phonetic values ⊂ = *r*, and ⌀ = *m*, the god of Hamath would be read *S-m*

(= אַשִׁימָא, 2 K 17[30]); 'king' would be *d-r* (cf. Τβερα in Τβερα-δηταs, or -δβερραs in Ρωμδβερραs etc.); 'great' would be *m-d*; 'I' would be *de* (cf. *du, zu*, in all N. Caucasian languages); and the word read *Tarsi* (Tarsus) by Jensen would rather be *Ko-de* (cf. Egyp. *Kode* = N. Syria and Cilicia). Further details on this point (*e.g.* that the king of Hamath v. is *Girpa-rudă*, that the king in the Lion inscription of Mar'ash and the king in the inscription of Ordasu or Milid bear the same name, probably *Tarku-nasi*, while the name of the king at Bulgarmaden should perhaps be read *Tarku-d-r*, *i.e.* Ταρκυνδβερραs etc. etc.) I intend to submit to the examination of experts in an early number of the *Proc. Soc. Bib. Arch.* (probably not before the end of June, as a large quantity of type has to be cast for it). But even if I should prove to be right with *Desandas* (*D-s-n-d-ś*), and, along with this, right in the view that the land of the Hamath inscriptions is *I-nu-g* (*i.e. Inogas* = Nukhassi), and that Jensen's so-called 'Wortbeschliesser' is probably an ideogram for 'son,' I shall not imagine that I have thus *deciphered* the Hittite inscriptions. There would still be a long way to traverse to their real decipherment, and this way can be prepared only by the discovery of further materials.

FRITZ HOMMEL.

Munich.

[The above note was originally sent by Professor Hommel as a postscript to his article last month, but arrived too late for publication. With his sanction its contents were communicated to Professor Jensen, and are dealt with by him this month in his reply to Professor Hommel's main article.—EDITOR.]

II.

IN reply to the remarks of Professors Sayce and Ramsay in the May number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES I should like to point out—

1. Professor Sayce seems to think that in my reply to him, in passing over in silence Leopold Messerschmidt's criticism of my labours at decipherment, I acted in my own interest but not in the interest of the truth. He considers himself also justified, in consequence of that criticism, in ignoring my labours because Messerschmidt has 'left nothing of my decipherment.' *I* can only wonder that Sayce, as likewise Hommel, has taken the above criticism seriously. But, to be sure, in Hittite matters jest passes for earnestness and earnestness for jest. When two scholars, whose scientific earnestness, critical faculty, and objective love of the truth are raised above all doubt,—namely, Dr. Brockelmann and Professor Zimmern,—while in their reviews they admit the correctness of my deciphering, treat the feebleness of Messerschmidt's criticism as notorious, I may surely be permitted to ignore it. By the way, Sayce himself frankly confesses that he has followed a similar practice towards my labours, even although these had not been proved to be in error. Besides, what does Professor Sayce think of his friend and brother in arms, Professor Hommel, adopting—without, it is true, except in two cases, acknowledging his debt—my interpretation of a number of signs and sign groups (the groups for 'king,' certain place names, a title, 'great,' the sign for 'queen,' the phonetic writing of the pronoun 'I') and implicitly much more?

2. Professor Sayce asserts that 'except at the outset of my studies, when like himself (Jensen) I (Sayce) was over sanguine of success, I have *never* attempted to decipher the Hittite inscriptions in the sense in which he uses the word' (*i.e.* to decipher them graphically and phonetically), that it is to the 'graphic decipherment' above that he has devoted himself, that for years past he has 'maintained that with our present materials the task is hopeless,' and that for nearly *twenty* years no attempts made by him to assign phonetic values to the Hittite signs have been published. In answer to this I hold him to the fact that in the year *1893*, in the 15th volume of the *Recueil de travaux*, he published an article entitled 'The Decipherment of the Hittite Inscriptions,' in which he gave as detailed a graphic *and phonetic* 'decipherment' as I myself have only quite recently been able to do. It is not the case then, note this by the way, that Sayce at any time at least before 1893 understood by 'decipherment' something different from and less than I understand by that term.

3. Professor Sayce declares that '"graphic decipherment" is a necessary preliminary to the interpretation of the texts, though it seems to me to have been neglected by Professor Jensen as well as by most of his predecessors.' But from my article in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY

TIMES one can see that it is precisely upon this that I have laid *all* emphasis, and any one who is interested in the subject may convince himself that in my first work on the Hittite inscriptions (*ZDMG*, xlviii), at the very beginning of my account of my deciphering, come sa long discussion of the graphic decipherment, which is only then followed by the phonetic decipherment. It will be evident, then, that *no one* has more sharply than myself kept these two problems of decipherment apart. So little does Sayce apparently know about my work; and yet he considers himself entitled to pass judgment upon it and to ignore it. *Sapienti sat.*

4. Professor Sayce, speaking as a moral censor, talks of my idea of my own 'infallibility,' because, forsooth, I maintain with firmness and confidence what in this instance is my own cause, but what I cannot but consider to be the cause of right. *I* should consider any one a poor creature who did not do the same in a like case. Sayce's reproach would apply only to one who, because of ignorance of the facts of the case, obstinacy, and self-sufficiency, should be unable to yield to the force of better arguments.

My position, then, is that Professor Sayce in *1893* considered himself able to 'decipher' the Hittite inscriptions in the sense attached by me to that term; further, that in 1894 my article appeared in the *ZDMG*; and that Sayce in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of December 1898 spoke of the inscriptions as 'undeciphered.' In view of this, I may be permitted to request Professor Ramsay, in spite of his want of time, to explain to me why I was not justified in writing the first three paragraphs of my reply to Professor Sayce, and how he discovers in these 'extraordinary misrepresentations' and mere 'absurd, irrelevant, and misleading' statements. The circumstance that Sayce in his article last month has returned to the belief that his 'method' of decipherment is still valid, or at least thinks that it has not been superseded by mine, does not alter the discrepancy between his views in 1893 and those expressed by him in December last. To emphasize this discrepancy was my aim. If Professor Ramsay meant by his rejoinder to take exception merely to my supposition that *I* had at last succeeded in converting Professor Sayce from his error, he seems, unfortunately, to be quite right in this, as the reply of the latter shows. But this seems to me quite irrelevant, and does not appear to justify such expressions as 'extraordinary misrepresentations,' etc.

P. JENSEN.

Marburg.

Genesis iv. 7 and iii. 16: A Suggestion.

I. GN 4^7 is a verse of well-known difficulties, and not the least of these arises in connexion with the last clause. This seems to echo in a remarkable manner the striking works of 3^{16b}. For the sake of comparison we place the two side by side:—

3^{16b} וְאֵל־אִישֵׁךְ תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ וְהוּא יִמְשָׁל־בָּךְ׃

4^{7b} וְאֵלֶיךָ תְּשׁוּקָתוֹ וְאַתָּה תִּמְשָׁל־בּוֹ׃

In reading Mr. Stanley A. Cook's interesting notes, in the March number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, on possible cases of confusion in the contents of parallel columns in pre-Masoretic MSS., it occurred to me that the text of the above-cited passages may afford an instance of confusion arising from the same cause. The interval between the two verses in Genesis occupies about 24 lines (containing 735 letters) in the ordinary printed editions of the Hebrew text; allowing for the omission of the *matres lectionis* this would give a column of from 21 to 23 lines, varying from 28 to 32 letters in length—which exactly corresponds to the column desiderated by Mr. Cook. We may therefore assume that the clauses in question probably stood exactly opposite each other in the old Hebrew MSS. If this was so it is certainly a noteworthy fact, and at once suggests that the last clause of Gn 4^7 is due to an accidental repetition of the corresponding words of 3^{16}, which (*ex hypothesi*) occupied a place immediately opposite in the previous column. The slight alterations in the form of the words would then be due to an attempt to adapt them to their new context, with which they originally had no connexion.

Certainly, as they now stand in the M.T. of 4^7 their logical connexion with the preceding part of the verse is not obvious, on any interpretation, and sense and context are considerably clarified by their omission. On the other hand, they perfectly fit the context, and afford a fine sense in 3^{16} (esp. if with Ball, *Genesis*, in P. Haupt's O.T., and

following the LXX we there read תשובתך for the doubtful (תשוקתך).

II. It remains to deal with the rest of the difficult verse 4^7 which in the M.T. runs הלוא אם תיטיב שאת ואם לא תיטיב לפתח חטאת רבץ. This, as Ball (*op. cit.*) justly observes, 'yields no adequate sense'; and he accordingly, on the basis of the LXX, restores הלוא אם תיטיב לשאת ואם לא תיטיב לְבַתֵּר חַטָּאת רֹבֵץ, *If thou makest a proper offering but dost not properly divide* (*the sacrificial victim*), *art thou not in fault? Quiet* (*lit. lie down*)! In other words, Cain's offence is a ritual one, and he is reminded that he has no ground of complaint for the rejection of an irregular offering. 'This sense,' as Ball points out, 'agrees with the context and with ancient ideas far better than any which can be wrested out of the doubtful Hebrew of M.T.' One serious criticism, however, must be made, though possibly it may not prove a fatal objection to the emended text. Cain's sacrifice was *not* an animal one (v.[3]). That being so, can לְבַתֵּר properly be applied to it? Possibly, however, this difficulty can be overcome by giving the words a wider range of application than to the immediate context.

One other, and this a minor, difficulty remains: רֹבֵץ in this connexion can hardly be right. I venture to propose רַב לָהּ, enough! (cf. Nu $16^{3.7}$); or possibly (תָּהּ) רַב עַ; cf. 2 S 24^{16}; though עתה in this connexion requires, according to usage, some words to follow.

G. H. Box.

Merchant Taylors' School, E.C.

Dr. W. H. Green of Princeton.

In The Expository Times of February 1896 an editorial notice of Dr. W. H. Green's treatise on *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* bore strong testimony to the scholarship of the author. Mention was made in that notice of a higher critic who had recently said, 'There is now but one Old Testament scholar who rejects the results of criticism.' That scholar was said to be Professor Green of Princeton. Criticism has advanced so far in three years that in The Expository Times of February 1899 even the scholarship of Dr. Green is completely discredited. The Rev. J. A. Selbie, on pp. 221–2, reproduces some criticisms of apologetic writings recently translated into German made by Dr. Steuernagel in the *Theologische Rundschau*. One of these books is Dr. Green's work above mentioned. Against him and other apologists Dr. Steuernagel brings what Mr. Selbie calls 'three serious charges.' I confine my attention to these serious charges as they affect Dr. Green. The second of them I take up first. It is evidently considered the gravest; and its statement in the English translation is followed by a note of exclamation. It runs as follows:—'Green sets up a man of straw [the original is, ein Zerrbild der Kritik] to represent the position of critics when he alleges that the latter, whenever the name *Jahweh* occurs in an "Elohistic" passage, assume that a redactor has either introduced a sentence from a parallel narrative or altered the original *Elohim* into *Jahweh*. Green actually makes this allegation in connexion with passages subsequent to Ex 3, although every critic knows that E tells us in Ex $3^{27ff.}$ of the revelation of the new Divine name Jahweh to Moses, and that from this point onwards the latter name even preponderates in E!' This looks bad for Green. But has Dr. Green 'set up a man of straw to represent the position of critics'? I will let the most distinguished of the higher critics tell in their own words their position in regard to the mooted point. They should know what they have been in the habit of teaching.

Dr. August Dillmann, in his treatise, 'Ueber die Composition des Hexateuch,' appended to the second edition of his *Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua*, p. 617, in treating of the Elohistic document, whose existence he and the other divisive critics postulate, writes thus:—'Das wichtigste Kennzeichen dieser Schrift ist die Benennung Gottes mit Elohim (auch nach der Einsetzung des Jahvenamens Ex. 3), welche E mit andern alten Geschichtsschreibern (in Jud. u. Sam., Vgl. Knobel, 561) gemeinsam hat; sie ist bei ihm durchgängig, u JHVH (Jehovah) in seinen Stücken erst durch die Späteren Bearbeiter hereingebracht.'

In this quotation Dillmann distinctly asserts that the most important criterion of the E document is its naming of the Deity by Elohim, and that God is so named in it both *before* and *after* Ex 3; that this use of Elohim in E is *thoroughgoing*, or universal; and that when the name Jehovah is found in passages belonging to E, its introduction

is to be ascribed to later hands. If Dillmann was competent to give an account of his own doctrine, Dr. Green must be acquitted of the charge of setting up a man of straw to represent his position.

Wellhausen is another critic who may be allowed to give testimony on this question. In his treatise, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des alten Testaments*, p. 72, speaking of Ex 3^{10-15}, which he claims for the Elohistic document, he remarks: 'Wirklich erscheint hier überall im Munde des Erzählers Elohim (vv. $^{11.12.13.14.15}$) während von nun ab dies Kriterium für längere Zeit aufhört, freilich wie es scheint mehr durch Schuld des Bearbeiters, als nach der Absicht des Elohisten selber, der nach wie vor für gewöhnlich den allgemeinen Namen gebraucht zu haben scheint.'

In this quotation Wellhausen clearly makes the use of the name Elohim a criterion of the E document, and ascribes the omission of this name in Elohistic passages after Ex 3 to the fault of the redactor, and not to the original author, whom Wellhausen holds to have, both before and after Ex 3, commonly employed the general name of God or Elohim. I have additional evidence at command. But surely enough has been produced to prove to the satisfaction of all reasonable men that the second charge brought against Dr. Green is not true, and that neither through dishonesty nor ignorance has he been guilty of misrepresenting the position of the higher critics. The case is so clearly in his favour that I suggest the propriety of his accusers making to him a public apology.

I now turn to consider the first charge made by Steuernagel, which is thus stated: 'It is surely a very superficial explanation of the interchange of the Divine names to say with Green that *Jahweh* is employed when God is thought of as the God of salvation and of gracious condescension, whereas the name *Elohim* is chosen when He appears as the Creator or Judge of the world. Why then, asks Steuernagel, is the God who enters into covenant with Noah (Gn. 9) and with Abraham (Gn. 17) called *Elohim*? Why is the God who executes judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah called *Jahweh*? Why is it that in perfectly parallel narratives we find at one time *Jahweh* and at another time *Elohim* (cf. Gn. 12^{10-20} with 20^{1-17}.)?'

If Dr. Green had given such an inadequate account of the Divine names as is here attributed to him, and had said that they were respectively used only in the cases mentioned, a very superficial and unsatisfactory explanation would be furnished of their interchange. How he really distinguishes Elohim and Jehovah can be learned from the book reviewed, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, pp. 102–3 and p. 106. But Dr. Green's most thorough connected discussion of this subject will be found in two papers in the *Homiletic Review* for August and September 1898, pp. 166 ff. and pp. 257 ff. He first examines the use of Elohim and Jehovah in the books that follow the Pentateuch, and then considers the use of these Divine names in the books of Moses. At the close of a very careful and complete study Dr. Green makes this claim, which, in my opinion, is not too strong: 'The Divine names occurring in the Pentateuch have now been considered in detail, and I think it may fairly be said that it has been shown that their employment is regulated by the same principles which prevail in the rest of the Old Testament. Jehovah is the name peculiar to the God of the chosen race, and is used when His relation to His own people is in the mind of the speaker or writer. Elohim represents the Divine Being under those aspects in which He is related, not to the chosen race merely, but to the whole world and to all men, as the Creator and universal Sovereign, controlling nature and the affairs of men. It is used, therefore, when the Most High is spoken of by Gentiles or in connexion with them; and when the Divine is contrasted with the human or with objects belonging to any other grade of being; and when the sense requires a common rather than a proper noun.'

I have not been able to discover in any of Dr. Green's writings that he has stated that *Jahweh* cannot be properly used when God is thought of as Judge of the world. He often refers to acts of judgment on the world inflicted by Jehovah. But I take up Steuernagel's questions *seriatim*. 'Why is the God who enters into covenant with Noah (Gn 9) and with Abraham (Gn 17) called *Elohim*?' The covenant described in Gn 9 was made, not with the chosen seed merely, but with all living creatures, with all flesh upon the earth (Gn $9^{9.10.15.17}$). Its universal character is made very prominent. Therefore the general name of God is most appropriate. When God is set forth as distinguishing the chosen seed from the rest of

mankind, then Jehovah is more fittingly used. See v.[26] of the same chapter, where we read: 'Blessed be Jehovah, God of Shem.' It is surely not by accident that in the next verse the blessing of Japheth is attributed to Elohim.

But why is it Elohim who enters into covenant with Abraham (Gn 17)? I answer that the first verse of Gn 17 tells us that it was Jehovah who did this; and I refuse to listen to the critics who in the interest of their theory say that this verse is an interpolation by R, or that R has at least substituted in it Jehovah for Elohim. But why is Elohim used throughout the remainder of the chapter? Because there is a peculiar propriety in speaking here of God in His character as the Omnipotent Creator. El Shaddai, God Almighty, is what Jehovah calls Himself in the first verse. There was special cause to dwell on God's power. The chapter begins with a significant mention of the great age of Abraham. See also v.[17]. A son by his wife did not seem to him within the bounds of possibility. But he is told definitely that Sarah should bear him a son in the next year, and that she should be a mother of nations. If, to strengthen the patriarch's faith, Jehovah in the beginning of the chapter thought it proper to call Himself El Shaddai, thus emphasizing His Divine power, it is in admirable keeping for the sacred narrator to use subsequently throughout the theophany the familiar name of Elohim, which is a nearer equivalent of El Shaddai than Jehovah is, and is more suggestive that power belongeth unto God than this latter name.

It is further asked: 'Why is the God who executes judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah called *Jahweh*?' I may let Dr. Green answer this question. 'It is Jehovah in chap. 18 who in condescending grace concludes the covenant transaction with Abraham by becoming his guest, and in the familiarity of friendship admits him to His counsel respecting Sodom, and accepts his intercession on its behalf; and who still further (19[1-28]) executes the purpose which He had disclosed to Abraham of *purging His own land* of gross offenders (13[13] 15[16] 18[20. 21])' (*Unity of Genesis*, p. 152).

I have another question to answer: 'Why is it that in perfectly parallel narratives we find at one time *Jahweh* and at another *Elohim* (cf. Gn 12[10-20] with 20[1-17])?' There is a remarkable resemblance between these two narratives. I add that there is a likeness between them which the divisive critics want to obliterate. In the earlier the name Jehovah is used but once, and no other name of God occurs in Gn 12[10-20]. In v.[17] Jehovah is said to have plagued Pharaoh and his house 'because of Sarai, Abram's wife.' In the similar narrative in Gn 20 the name Jehovah occurs once (v.[18]), and that too in describing the judgment inflicted by Jehovah on Abimelech's house, 'because of Sarah, Abraham's wife.' The correspondence is striking. But such critics as Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Dillmann cannot tolerate in an Elohistic chapter a verse in which the name Jehovah is found, and accordingly they ascribe this verse to R. But it closely connects with the preceding sentence, which is, in fact, unintelligible without it. It is easy to account for the use of Elohim throughout the rest of Gn 20. It was shown long ago that for Abimelech God is Elohim. He knew not Jehovah. Only as Elohim could God appear to him. Abraham uses in conversation with Abimelech Elohim, while he accommodates himself to His standpoint. He prays to Elohim, for his intercession is uttered in the ears of the King. How the use of Elohim is occasioned by the contents of the chapter appears very clearly from v.[11], where Abraham says, 'Because I thought, surely the fear of Elohim is not in this place.' There was in Gerar the fear of Elohim, but not of Jehovah.

Dr. Green is censured further for maintaining that 'Scripture is an organism whose parts are inspired by God, and consequently combine in a harmonious whole.' This charge is true. But the view condemned was the view which Christ and His apostles held and taught concerning Holy Scripture. It is the view to which those who call Jesus Master are committed; and it can be vindicated against all impugners. But I cannot discuss here this and one or two other points which I would be glad to dwell upon.

Let me contradict but one more false charge which is thus made: 'Green denies, of course, that the critics believe in Divine revelation at all.' This is a random fling unworthy of a serious critic. I could prove its falsity by abundant references to Dr. Green's published opinions. There is room here for only one brief quotation. Even of Dr. C. A. Briggs, whose utterances Dr. Green must have often felt to be painful and provoking, he could use this language of wide charity (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, October 1893, p. 553): 'Beyond question Dr. Briggs is honestly aiming to

defend the revealed Word of God and evangelical religion against the hostile attacks of a destructive and revolutionary criticism.'

DUNLOP MOORE.

Pittsburg, Pa. U.S.A.

Gleanings in the Books of Kings.

2 K 17^{29} (E.V.)—'And the men of Babylon made Succoth-benoth.' Benzinger, in his new commentary on Kings, remarks that Sukkoth-Benōth is still unexplained. Schrader's view (*KAT*, 281) is no doubt scarcely tenable. But a clue may be got from a work well known to all scholars. If Benzinger had referred to Delitzsch's *Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 215, he would have seen that in 1881 that eminent Assyriologist explained the name as *Sakkut-binutu* (?), 'supreme judge of creation.' Delitzsch has no doubt (see *Calwer Bibel-lexikon*, *s.v.*) abandoned this view for good reasons. But it should be plain to those who study the habits and dangers of the scribes that סכות בנות is really סַכּוּת כַּיְוָן, Sakkuth Kaiwān (ת in בנות is due to assimilation). Compare the inserted passage Am 5^{26}, 'That is, ye took up Saccuth and Kaiwān,' or rather, Saccut and Kaiwān being both names of the Babylonian Saturn, 'ye took up Saccuth-Kaiwān.' The only possible alternative, I think, is to read 'Sakkuth and Nebo'; but this combination no Assyriological student can call probable. I have already pointed out a very probable occurrence of Kaiwān in Ezk 7 (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 1898, p. 142).

2 K 18^{34}.—Winckler (*Alttest. Untersuchungen*, pp. 102 f.) has already pointed out that 2 K 18^{34} must originally have run, 'Where are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? where are the gods of Sepharvaim and of 'Avvah (?)'? In *Isaiah* (Haupt's Hebrew Bible), in dealing with Is 37^{13}, I have adopted this view, but in the text of the notes (p. 114), I have left the correct reading of the name of the last-mentioned place an open question. Kittel, in his new edition of Dillmann's commentary on Isaiah, chronicles previous suggestions. It is not very bold to suppose that עוה or עוא is a corruption of עַזָּה, 'Gaza,' and that the reference is to the conquest of Gaza by Tiglath-Pileser in 734 B.C., when, according to Winckler's restoration of a defective passage in his inscription, that king introduced the cultus of his god Assur (*Gesch. Bab. u. Ass.*, 228, 333). I am sorry not to be able to accept Professor Hommel's most ingenious suggestion (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, April 1898) that Hena' and 'Avvah may be star-names; Hena' is, I agree with Winckler, entirely due to corruption, and a name corresponding to Sepharvaim is absolutely required to complete the parallelism. Nor can I believe that Nibhaz, the god of the Avvites in 2 K 17^{31} is Nipḫu-Ṣalmu; it is most probably nothing more nor less than Marduk (נבחז corrupted from ברמד, *i.e.* מרדך). Not improbably Adrammelech and Anammelech are also corruptions of Marduk. I have already offered this as an alternative to a less simple conjecture (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, ix. 428 f. [1898]). Certainly, Hamath and Avvah have no right to exist in 2 K 17^{24}, as the context requires well-known Babylonian cities, and the so-called 'Avvites' are intruders in 2 K 17^{31}, as Winckler has shown. On the god Tartāk cf. my article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xvii. 105 [1898]; I come to the same conclusion as Winckler. תרתח=תרתק (Job 38^{36}); Tartaḫan was, we are assured, a title of the god Ninib.

This is a list of the divine names in 2 K $17^{30f.}$ with their identifications—

Succoth-benoth = Sakkuth-Kaiwān (Ninib) = *Saturn*.
Nergal = *Mars*.
Ashima = Ishtar = *Venus*.
Nibhaz (Nibhan) = Marduk = *Jupiter*.
Adrammelech = ,, ,,
Anammelech = ,, ,,
Tartak or Tartaḫ = the lance-star (Antares).

T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

The Wells of Beersheba.

I HAVE received here the number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of this month (April), where you have inserted my letter from Jerusalem on the Wells of Beersheba. There has occurred in it a printer's error, in page 329, line 11, which makes a sentence quite incomprehensible. Instead of 'in "style" the place was entirely desert,' read, 'in "1894" the place was entirely desert.'

LUCIEN GAUTIER.

Haifa, Palestine.

The Capture of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar.

Mr. Selbie will find the information he needs in a very accessible quarter, *The Records of the Past*, new series, iv. pp. 99–100 (1890), where Mr. Pinches has published the translation of a contract-tablet, from the dating of which we learn that in the fortieth year of Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon was king also of Tyre.

A. H. Sayce.

Oxford.

Heb. xiii.; 2 Tim. iv.

No one would naturally call the 'Epistle' to the Hebrews short. Does the writer call it so himself (13^{22})? He says he is sending a short letter, and as the letter is short he begs his readers to have patience for the word of exhortation. A sermon as long as the 'Epistle' would not be short for a sermon. A sermon in comparison of which the 'Epistle' would be short would be very, very long. Is not the bulk of Hebrews a homily pure and simple, and does not 13^{22} come straight from an ἐπιστολὴ σοστατικὴ, recommending the homilist to his hearers? There is a noteworthy parallel, 1 P $5.^{12}$. Peter says he sends a short letter by Silvanus, the faithful brother (such he accounts him, the commendation is not ambiguous but guarded), who clearly intends to visit the brethren of the Dispersion from Pontus round about to Bithynia, passing through Galatia, Cappadocia, and Asia. The whole letter is as nearly as possible one-third of the length of Hebrews; and one-third of that from 1^{3}–2^{10} has more periodic structure and more literary intention than most of the rest; perhaps it gives us a taste of the quality of Silvanus as a homilist.

In Hebrews we have a complete homily, with its natural and impressive beginning and end in 1^{1} and 12^{29}; the full-toned emphasis of both is just alike, and unlike most classical models, where both the exordium and the epilogue are pitched somewhat lower. Have we one homogeneous letter of commendation in chap. 13? It might seem at first as though vv.$^{8\text{-}16}$ at anyrate were part of the homily; but though the writer adopts the line of thought of the homily, his point of view is perceptibly different. The homily shows that the privileges of Christians under the gospel are immeasurably greater than those of Israel under the Lord. Believers enter in spirit the Temple not made with hands, of which temple and tabernacle were figures, as the continual offerings there were figures of the One Offering by which they are perfected by the One Priest. In $13^{10\text{-}14}$, etc., we find for the first time the thought that the higher and lower privileges are mutually exclusive, the servants of the tabernacle cannot eat of the Christian Altar; believers who are sanctified by the one offering for sin must follow their High Priest without the camp, bear His reproach, and be rejected with Him by Israel after the flesh. Would this have been so hard when city and temple were laid waste and wrath had come upon Israel to the uttermost? Was not $13^{8\text{-}16}$ written while the temple stood and the Jews could believe they had a continuing city here? by him who was a debtor both to Jew and Greek, and could become as a Jew to gain the Jews in deeper ways than by having his head shorn and being at charges with Nazarites?

Yet chap. 13 cannot be assumed to be homogeneous till we can explain the double reference to ἡγούμενοι in vv.$^{7.\ 17}$. The salutation to the same persons in v.^{24} makes no difficulty; but can the same writer bid his readers remember their (departed) rulers, and then, without arranging the matter in any way, bid them obey their (living) rulers ten verses later? If from this starting-point it should prove possible to disengage, in whole or in part, two commendatory letters from He 13, the African tradition of a letter of Barnabas and the Alexandrian tradition (which gave so much trouble to Alexandrian scholars) of a letter of Paul would henceforth support one another. Besides, the double passage on Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ($11^{8\text{-}16.\ 17\text{-}22}$) suggests that the homily was delivered twice.

In the meantime, the familiar comparison of He 13 with the practical precepts we find at or near the close of more than one Pauline letter, will gain new weight, so will Luther's guess that Hebrews, or the bulk of it, comes from Apollos. If the work in the oldest form known had one or more letters of commendation (or excerpts from such) written by an apostle or apostles attached to it, tradition would ascribe the whole to the higher authority. He 13 contains more than one unobtrusive point of contact with St. Paul. Gal 5^{2}: 'If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit

you nothing,' is like the mutual exclusiveness of the shadowy privileges of the law and the substantial privileges of the gospel. The comparison of the present state of believers (13^{14}) to that of the homeless patriarchs, which recalls Ph 3^{20}, is anticipated in the homily (11^{14}), where we also find (4^{5}) that the rest given to Israel by Joshua was not its rest. The writer's appeal to his good conscience (v.[18]) is like St. Paul's testimonies to himself (1 Th 2^{10}, and Acts 24^{16} (before Felix)). If v.[19] was written by St. Paul the homily was hardly addressed to the Church of Jerusalem. After he had taken such pains to bring the alms of his converts in person to 'the poor saints,' he was held at arm's length till an arrangement had been made which might convince those zealous of the law that he also walked orderly. In carrying this arrangement out he came to be falsely accused, and neither St. James nor any of the brethren saw their way to bear witness for him before Annas or Felix. After this experience can St. Paul have counted on the eagerness of the brethren at Jerusalem to have him 'restored' to them? If St. Paul is the writer, we might think of the Jewry of Antioch; the homily is no doubt addressed to a Christian Jewry.

Vv.[20. 21] may be compared with 2 Ti 4^{5-8}, which are certainly genuine, if anything in the Pastoral Epistles is, and may be summed up thus: 'Make full proof of your ministry [on your own account, no longer as my son or under-servant, Ph 2^{22}], for my work is over, my reward is sure.' Is the sum of He $13^{20. 21}$ like this: 'May God fit you to do His will and do with me after His good pleasure'?[1] If so we have the same thought as in 2 Ti; the writer's active service is over; nor is the fact that he speaks in the plural a proof that he is speaking in the name of all Christians, not for himself alone. St. Paul often changes from the singular to the plural (*e.g.* 2 Co $1^{17. 18}$ $2^{23. 24}$ $3^{13. 14}$), where we cannot infer that he changes from speaking of himself alone to speaking of himself and one or more fellow-labourers. V.[19], which cannot be divided from vv.[20. 21], expresses the writer's hope of temporal deliverance, while the sequel veils his doubt whether the temporal deliverance is sure. He speaks in prison and persecution of the God of Peace, who raised from the dead the Shepherd (Is 63^{11} 70) [whom He first delivered to death] in the blood of an everlasting covenant [whereby (Zec 9^{11}) the prisoners are brought up out of the pit]; he trusts God for life and death. This reticence is the answer to another objection, that the antithesis between 'you' and 'us' is hardly marked; perhaps the writer's resignation is too deep and quiet for emphasis. Certainly he does not write in the prospect of instant martyrdom; but is the tradition that 2 Ti 4^{6} was written in that anticipation well founded? It rests on a comparison with Ph 2^{17}, where Paul's blood or life is conceived as a drink-offering poured on the sacrifice of the Philippians' faith. There the metaphor is plainly expressed; here we have to infer it from a parallel passage, which Timothy, if he ever read it, might or might not remember. Apart from this the notion of the apostle as a victim released from labour for sacrifice—on the point of being consecrated (if victims were so consecrated) by the libation—seems at least as likely. Κακοπάθησον, as we know from A, reminded an early reader of the military metaphor in 2^{3}; if St. Paul too had this in his mind we get an easy sense for σπένδομαι. St. Paul is a veteran waiting his discharge under a flag of truce, he has no longer to contend with false brethren,—it is for *this* conflict that Timothy is to brace himself,—he is past being troubled (Gal 6^{17}). Possibly, again, he pours his drink-offering as a traveller starting on a journey. The precise sense of the enigmatical word can only be determined by the discovery of new parallels.[2] In the meantime, the traditional sense is discredited by the equally indisputable sequel. All the commissions and cautions are unlike a dying man; the writer is in a hurry for Timothy to come, simply because he is old and lonely; there is not a hint 'if you wish to find me alive.' This alone is inconclusive; yet if the writer triumphantly announces his impending martyrdom (v.[6]), why does he ignore it (vv.[9-16])? Why, above all, in

[1] The text is far from clear; the latest editors read ποιῶν ἐν ἡμῖν not ὑμῖν. The well-attested αὐτῷ before ποιῶν is unintelligible; αὐτῷ ποιῶν, though barely possible, is improbable and awkward after αὐτοῦ (the only natural sense of the phrase would be more probably expressed by περιποιούμενος). Is not αὐτῷ simply a misplaced variant on ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ? αὐτὸς (71) is an emendation possibly right but hardly elegant. διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is perplexing; if the text is right, is it to be connected with ποιῶν or τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐν. αὐ? ποιῶν is not the same as ἐνεργῶν (Ph 2^{13}); it is better to compare ἵνα οὕτω γένηται ἐν ἐμοί (1 Co 9^{15}), ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ (Mt 17^{12}); if so, δ. Ἰ. Χ. will be connected with τὸ εὐάρ. κ.τ.λ. Whatever God purposes in Him is sure to be a purpose of peace. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ where it stands is the obvious antecedent to ᾧ in the doxology, which most critics refer, notwithstanding, to God. If the words stood in the oldest copies which contained them at the end of the doxology, where they would read quite smoothly, we might account for the transposition by supposing that the archetype of all our copies had them in the margin.

[2] Such parallels might not impossibly prove that a drink-offering was a commonplace for martyrdom, like departure for death, so that, obscure as it is to us, it might come fitly before the distinct and vivid metaphors of the conflict, the race, and the prize.

v.[17], after giving thanks for strength to deliver a good testimony, does he go on to give thanks for a temporal deliverance? He is certainly quoting Ps 22[21], so we cannot be sure that he is giving thanks for escape from the kind of death St. Ignatius coveted. The deliverance is an earnest of deliverance from every evil work, a pledge that no evil work shall hurt him; but, after all, the deliverance is of the same order as in 2 Co 1[10]. Everybody had deserted him; but he had come off safe from his first hearing.

G. A. SIMCOX.

Aspley Guise.

On Methods of Historical Study.

I OWE so much to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES that I do not like to demur to any of its statements, but I must needs take exception to the impression which the last number would give—not so much of anything of mine, as of the opinions and arguments of my friend and colleague Dr. Moberly. If he really held what he is represented as holding, I might indeed be blamed for conceding as much as I have done to him.

Let me take some of the leading points in order.

(1) Dr. Moberly has not said that special knowledge is not 'necessary in order to the writing of the best, that is, the most scientific, book,' and that what is lacking in knowledge can be supplied by reasoning. He has only said that there is room for a book which is not written with special knowledge. There are, of course, different standards of what is meant by 'special knowledge'; and Dr. Moberly's estimate of his own is modest. But I submit that he has made good his position, and really brought out a number of considerations which in any future treatment of the subject cannot be neglected.

(2) Perhaps 'presupposition' was a hazardous word to use. It is too apt to seem convertible with 'prejudice.' But I believe that it will be found that the way in which Dr. Moberly has used the word falls under one or other of the following heads: (*a*) We all have our presuppositions, and it is important that these should be distinctly faced and acknowledged, and not allowed to be latent or disguised. (*b*) Every man is bound to take as much care with his presuppositions as with the arguments that are built upon them. They should be based (Dr. Moberly would say) on the widest possible induction. (*c*) The main principles of the Christian faith are in this sense presuppositions. As such they underlie large tracts of our reasoning, which are inevitably influenced by them. Our conclusions must be different according as we hold these 'presuppositions' or do not hold them.

(3) I am not sure that Dr. Moberly has anywhere said that the function of the deductive method is to 'fill up the gaps that are left by the available historical data.' But if he had said this, I might say very much the same thing from a point of view that is commonly supposed to be the opposite of the deductive. There are many cases in which direct evidence fails, where we have no resource but to use evidence that is indirect. Such would be inference backwards from the state of things existing as soon as we have knowledge of it; or inference forwards from the necessary working of causes proved to have been previously in existence. There is nothing in such a mode of argument that is unhistorical or unscientific.

(4) Dr. Moberly and I are placed in opposition to each other on a point on which we are really agreed. To the best of my knowledge Dr. Moberly has nowhere maintained that the 'breach of organized unity' by the Reformers was 'wilful.' On the contrary, I had expressly claimed his assent, if not exactly to the contention that the action of the Reformers was not wilful, at least to the admission that the greatest care in the weighing of circumstances would be needed before deciding that it was. And the assent which I had claimed I know is cordially given. There is no difference of principle between us on this head.

(5) Lastly, there is the question of the great 'as if.' I still hold my judgment somewhat in suspense on this point. But it is only fair to Dr. Moberly to say that if I should end by accepting what I believe that he would teach upon it, the first impulse in that direction came to me, if I am not mistaken, some time ago, not from him but—there may be some surprise at the name—from Dr. Hort's *Hulsean Lectures*. I have also been led by the progress of my own thought, more especially in connexion with the study of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, to doubt the sufficiency of the conception I had formed of Personality. The subject of Personality is one upon which many minds are now at work, and I believe that their labour will not be in vain.

I have thought it right to call attention to these points, because just at this moment it is more than ever important that our differences should not seem greater than they are.

W. SANDAY.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Professor Margoliouth has published a pamphlet on the Origin of the Original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus. Along with the review copy, he sends the following note:—'I beg that you will submit the enclosed pamphlet for review to some Semitic scholar, if possible an unbeliever, and request him to defend the genuineness of the document called the Original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus against my arguments. If he is either unwilling or unable to do that, kindly inform the world that the Hebrew scholars of Europe have been caught misdating a document by 1300 years, and that it is therefore probable that their conclusions concerning the dates of the documents of the Old Testament are disfigured by serious errors.'

The point of that note will be best appreciated by those who remember an earlier pamphlet of Professor Margoliouth's and what it led to. Nine years ago Professor Margoliouth published a pamphlet in which he contended that the higher critics were utterly wrong in the date they had assigned to such books as Ecclesiastes and Daniel. They had assigned dates to these books pretty closely corresponding to the time when it is known that the book of Ecclesiasticus was originally written. The Book of Ecclesiasticus was originally written in Hebrew, but the Hebrew original was lost, the book had come down to us in Greek. Professor Margoliouth worked on the Greek, found that it demanded a Hebrew original in metre, turned it back into that supposed Hebrew original, and showed that it was rabbinic Hebrew, wholly different from the Hebrew of Daniel or Ecclesiastes. The Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, said Professor Margoliouth, is centuries later than the Hebrew of Daniel or Ecclesiastes. But we know when Ecclesiasticus was written. Daniel and Ecclesiastes must have been written centuries earlier—centuries earlier than the higher critics asserted.

The higher critics criticized that pamphlet. They denied that the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus was in metre. They denied that it was rabbinic Hebrew. They denied that the Hebrew to which Professor Margoliouth 'restored' the Greek was anything like the original Hebrew.

Six years passed. Mrs. Lewis of Cambridge was passing through Palestine. Among some Hebrew MSS which she bought there a leaf was found which, on examination, was pronounced to be a leaf of the lost original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus. Mr. Schechter edited and translated it. And he had just done so when other nine leaves, following on at the point where Mrs. Lewis's leaf broke off, were discovered in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. This also was edited, translated, and published. It was seen at once that

the Hebrew was not rabbinic Hebrew. It was not 'new' Hebrew of any kind. It was good biblical Hebrew, and actually contained fewer 'new' words than were to be found in the Book of Ecclesiastes.

The discovery was a triumphant vindication of the higher criticism. All European Hebrew scholars were interested. Many wrote dissertations on the discovery, or published editions of the precious fragments. Professor Margoliouth held his peace.

Three years have passed since the discovery. Professor Margoliouth has published another pamphlet. He contends that this is not the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus at all. It is a retranslation into Hebrew out of a Syriac and a Persian translation. The translator was an Arab, at least Arabic was his native language, but he had learned Persian. And he lived after 1000 A.D.

'This, then,' says Professor Margoliouth, 'is the miserable trap in which all the Hebraists of Europe have been ensnared. It was I that decoyed them into it, it is I that let them out of it. Driver and Nöldeke are not quite the men to be caught napping; but owing to a controversy in which we had been engaged, they had an *interest* in thinking this rubbish genuine; and it was this interest which put them off their guard. Mrs. Lewis, by her precious discovery, has hit biblical criticism harder than it ever was hit before, or is ever likely to be hit again. For the next time we proceed to parcel out Isaiah, will not our very street boys call out to us, "You who misdate by 1300 years a document before you, what do *you* know of the dates of the Prophecies and Psalms?"'

We have sent the pamphlet to a most learned Hebrew scholar. We shall see.

Was Jesus justly condemned to death? There were two trials, if not three, if not four. We speak at present of the trial by the Jewish Sanhedrin—its president, Caiaphas, in the chair. Was Jesus condemned in accordance with a just interpretation of the law? Professor Dalman of Leipzig and Mr. Taylor Innes of Edinburgh both hold that He was.

Professor Dalman has written an article to the *Sunday School Times* of 6th May on the condemnation of Jesus Christ. Mr. Taylor Innes has just published a small book on *The Trial of Jesus Christ* (T. & T. Clark, crown 8vo, pp. 224, 2s. 6d.). Between them, but chiefly from Mr. Taylor Innes, we learn how greatly the question has been disputed. The disputants have been chiefly Jews. Salvador in 1822 included a chapter on 'the Judgment of Jesus' in his *History of the Institutions of Moses*, and argued that the judgment was inevitable if the tribunal adhered to its own Mishnic law. He was brilliantly answered by Dupin. But Dupin answered on the moral not the legal question. Salvador replied that he was considering not whether Jesus deserved to die, but whether His judges judged in accordance with their own law when they condemned Him to die; and in the third edition of his *Institutions* in 1862 he restated all his original arguments. Then came the brothers Lémann, Jews by descent but Roman Catholics by profession. They argued that in twenty-seven respects the Jewish court of justice acted illegally. They based their argument, however, on the law of the Talmud, and the law of the Talmud was not in force in the time of Jesus. Both Dalman and Taylor Innes hold that, according to the law which they were there to administer, the Jewish Sanhedrin could not do other than condemn Jesus to death.

When the Sanhedrin met, the prospect of getting Jesus condemned was not bright. They had already resolved upon His death unofficially. To get an official condemnation was another thing. For the law was very explicit, and it was altogether on the side of the accused. They stretched it as far as they could. The trial was held at night,

though, in spirit at least, the law demanded that a criminal trial should be begun and ended in daylight. They sought for witnesses, and encouraged them to produce their evidence, be it true or false. Immoral the trial certainly was. How outrageously immoral we do not realize until we recognize the fact which Taylor Innes brings before us, that the law commanded the high priest to warn each witness before he gave his evidence. The words of the warning are most impressive: 'Forget not, O witness, that it is one thing to give evidence in a trial as to money, and another in a trial for life. In a money suit, if thy witness-bearing shall do wrong, money may repair that wrong. But in this trial for life, if thou sinnest, the blood of the accused, and the blood of his seed, to the end of time shall be imputed unto thee.'

They found that, after all, there was little that Jesus had said or done to rest a charge upon. The most plausible thing seemed to be His words about the temple. But the witnesses to that contradicted one another. Wherein the contradiction lay we are not told. But, as Taylor Innes says, so slight a discrepancy as one asserting that He said, 'I am able to destroy this temple,' the other that He said, 'I will destroy this temple,' was enough to nullify their testimony. For in a Hebrew criminal trial 'the least discordance,' says Salvador, 'between the evidence of the witnesses was held to destroy its value.'

The prospect of condemnation was not very bright at the first. It grew darker as the trial went on. Why did they not accuse Him of claiming to be the Messiah? Apparently because there was no evidence that He ever had made that claim. There were those who hailed Him as the Messiah, but there were none who would come forward and say that He had accepted the honour. Caiaphas, however, conceives that it may be possible to get Him to accept it now. It will not be certain death even if He does. The Messiah was either to be a prophet or a king. If he accepts the title of Messiah, it will be just possible to accuse Him to Pilate of claiming to be a king. It may be possible even to condemn Him on the Jewish law, by dealing with Him as a false prophet. For the law says that 'the prophet which shall speak a word presumptuously in the name of God, which I have not commanded him to speak, that same prophet shall die' (Dt 18^{20}).

Caiaphas tries it. What was his surprise and joy to hear Jesus claim the glory which belongs to God! To accept the Messiahship is something, and He does that. But He does far more than that. He claims to be on an equality with God and to exercise His highest prerogatives. 'What need we any further witnesses, ye have heard the blasphemy; what think ye? And they all condemned Him to be guilty of death.'

They could not do otherwise. And Jesus meant it so. They are not excused by the legality of their condemnation. They are morally as guilty as unjust judges can ever be. But Jesus would not be condemned on any false charge of claiming to be a king or a prophet. He would be condemned for having come into the world to save sinners.

When a book is published in several volumes, it generally happens that the first volume receives all the attention from reviewers, the rest are dismissed in a paragraph. With the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE that has not been so. The second volume has been as fully reviewed as the first, and even more favourably. Its great theological articles seem to carry a more direct and impressive appeal than the critical articles which were the strength of the first volume.

One might even contend that reviewers have given the larger articles more than their just share of attention. It would be rash to say that more ability, it would be wrong to say that more pains, had been spent on them than on the smaller articles. If the reputation of the Dictionary were to be staked on one feature rather

than another, those who are most familiar with it would probably choose the exact scholarship of the minute articles. Still it was natural, perhaps inevitable, that when the new volume came to hand the first to be read and the most to be admired should be the great theological articles, and especially the article by Professor Sanday on JESUS CHRIST.

And it will not be out of place if here and now the editor makes this confession. When it became known that Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* was not likely to be revised beyond the first volume, those who had waited for that revision till patience was sorely tried, knew that the matter could not rest there. The greatest need of our time was the need of a Dictionary of the Bible. An effort must be made to meet it. The Dictionary must be full, in touch with the latest knowledge, and entirely original. Having been encouraged by the one scholar in Scotland who was most able to speak, the editor went to Oxford and saw Professor Sanday. When Professor Sanday approved of the scheme and said he would write the article on JESUS CHRIST, there was no more hesitation. That article exceeds the highest expectation that was formed of it. But even then it was clear that it would be the making of a new Dictionary.

What mean ye by this Feast? the son said as the Passover was laid on the table; and the father answered in set form of words. What mean ye by this Feast? our sons are asking about that Supper that has taken the place of the Passover. They are asking in greater perplexity, and we have no set form of words in which to answer them. The Passover was the great occasion for the temporary union of all Israel, however scattered and separated at other times. The Lord's Supper is the great occasion for the separation and disruption of Christendom, however otherwise at one.

And yet there is one feature of the Lord's Supper in which we may all agree. It is, moreover, so fundamental a feature that, agreeing on it, we may be led to agreement on much else. It is the meaning that the Supper had to the Lord Himself.

For we must remember that our Lord partook of the Supper Himself. He was no mere spectator, dictating a rite in which He had no share. He was the first Communicant. And He has told us what the Supper meant to Him. He opened His heart frankly to the disciples as they reclined beside Him. He told them in few words much of the sacredness that the occasion had for Him, and the satisfaction that it brought to His soul. What mean ye by this Feast? Our sons can ask the Master of the Feast Himself, and the answer is both essential and unmistakable.

The *Methodist Times* recently published a Communion Address by Professor Findlay of Headingley College, Leeds, giving it this title: 'The Lord at the Lord's Supper.' Professor Findlay finds four things that the Supper was to our Lord Himself.

First, it was a special occasion to Him. 'With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I die.' It was not a matter of small account whether He held this Passover or not. It was not a matter of little moment whether or not He took His part in it. He had looked forward to this Hour. He had counted upon this Feast. The evangelist brings out the intensity of the expression by reproducing the Hebrew phrase, 'With desire I have desired.' Therefore we do not follow the Master if we turn our back upon the Lord's Supper, if we thrust it into a corner, if we belittle or neglect it.

Next, it was a Feast with a history. It had a history behind it as well as before. 'With desire I have desired to eat *this Passover*.' It was the ancient rite of Israel. It was the most sacred and symbolic act in the ancient Church of God. He came not to destroy it, but to fulfil. He appro-

priates the table of Moses for His own Communion. 'Himself the true Paschal Lamb, He takes from the provisions of the original Feast consecrated by the use of fourteen centuries, the bread and cup that should serve for His own memorials to the end of time. At that Supper, the last of the old order and the first of the new, He communes in spirit with all the saints of the ages, past and to come. Moses and Elijah sit down with Peter and John. Prophets and apostles meet at "this Passover"—and Jesus in the midst.'

What else was the Supper to Christ Himself? In the third place, says Professor Findlay, it was a sign of brotherhood. He did not commune with the ancient past in private and alone. Together with His disciples He rehearsed the original act. Hand joined to hand; eye met kindling eye. They tasted the same broken loaf; the same covenant cup passed from lip to lip. 'With desire have I desired to eat this Passover *with you*.' The heirs of that Divine past, the heralds of a yet Diviner future, to share the meal with them was to Jesus a true Communion feast. The Supper was a means of sealing His fellowship with His disciples.

Nor was it for their sakes alone that He held this Passover in fellowship with them. As the hour of His agony drew nearer, He took Peter and James and John with Him. Already he longs intensely for their fellowship. He would open His heart to them. Through them He would realize the worth of the souls He was dying to save. 'You are they,' He says, 'who have continued with Me in my trials.' And now He takes them into full confidence. 'All things that I have heard from my Father I have made known unto you.' Thus the Supper was a preparation and support for Calvary. 'It was to Him first, as often to His people afterwards, a true *viaticum*—a draught of pure joy to cheer His spirit before He suffered. "My joy," He said to His friends—the joy radiant in his face as He looked upon them, the joy of perfect obedience to God and perfect fellowship with men—"shall remain in you, and your joy shall be full."'

But last of all, and most of all, the Lord's Supper was to the Lord Himself an act of consecration. 'With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you *before I suffer*.' It is the instrument which binds Him to His atoning death. If the words 'this Passover' looked back, the words 'I suffer' look forward. They give to the rite its new prospective character. They turn the great page of history. They inaugurate the new redemption as the first Passover inaugurated the deliverance from Egyptian bondage.

The Lord's Supper is the instrument which binds Him to His atoning death. And it is not laid up out of sight in the archives of heaven. It is a document intrusted to the Church on earth. The bread and wine are the sign-manual of the Crucified. 'See, Lord,' our humble faith appeals, 'What means this broken bread, and the wine-cup of Thy table? What hast Thou said concerning them? Is it not Thy Body given for us? Thy Blood shed for many for the remission of sins? Hast Thou forgot? Wilt Thou deny Thine own tokens?' He does not. He cannot. He abideth faithful.

But the compact is mutual. If He is consecrated to His death, so are we to ours. If He sanctifies Himself thereby, it is that we also may be sanctified in truth. The Communion is more than a commemoration. It is a mutual pledge, a joint engagement. It is the betrothal of Christ and the Church before the Father. In the last Supper Christ's brethren bind themselves to Him as He to them. And with the Covenant vow there is given the Covenant grace. For it is no dead hero we commemorate; it is a Lord that liveth and abideth for ever, who Himself puts into our hands the tokens of His dying and undying love, and enriches the believer with the benefits of the Covenant of Grace.

Professor Dalman on 'The Son of Man.'

By the Rev. David Eaton, M.A., Glasgow.

Professor Dalman of Leipzig, who is one of the greatest living Aramaic scholars, has recently published the first volume of a work on 'The Words of Jesus,'[1] the fruit of many years' study. In secs. 1 and 2 of the Introduction he shows that Aramaic was the mother-tongue of our Saviour; that He must have spoken Aramaic to His disciples and the people; and that a collection of His sayings meant for 'Hebrews' would in all probability have been written not in Hebrew, but in Aramaic. In sec. 3 he discusses the Hebraisms and Aramaisms of the Synoptic Gospels, and gives a select list of them in sec. 4. In the latter section he also explains the remarkable fact that Hebraisms properly so-called occur especially in Luke, and more particularly in the first chapters. In these chapters, however, Luke is not using a translation from a Hebrew original; his Hebraising style is due to himself. Here, as in the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles, he, in keeping with the wonderful contents of the narrative, uses the biblical style more consistently than elsewhere. His Hebraisms should rather be called 'Septuaginta-Græcisms.'

In secs. 5 and 6 he shows that there is no good reason for believing in the existence of an original gospel in Hebrew, and that the early tradition, according to which there was an original Gospel of Matthew in Aramaic, still lacks confirmation. There is nothing improbable in the view that the occasional agreement of the Synoptists in the matter of expression points to the sources used by them being written in Greek. The Christian Church had, even in Jerusalem, many Hellenists (*i.e.* Greek-speaking Jews) among its members. It was, therefore, from the first bilingual; in the gatherings of the infant community Jesus' deeds and words must have been narrated both in Greek and Aramaic. The 'Hebrews' would understand a little Greek; but very frequently the 'Hellenists' would understand no Aramaic or Hebrew. The earliest 'Gospel' *might* have been written in Greek.

In sec. 7 he explains the aim he has set before himself in this work, which is to consist of several volumes. It is a fact that Jesus spoke to the Jews in Aramaic, and that the apostles did so also (though not exclusively). It is only for the *words* of Jesus that an original Aramaic form (not necessarily written) is beyond dispute. It is the duty of biblical science to inquire what the words of Jesus were in this, their original form, and what sense they had in this form to the Jewish hearers; to think them back, as it were, into the original language and the contemporary way of thinking. This can be done only approximately; but it can be done, in the case of the leading thoughts and frequently used terms in the Synoptists, with a great measure of success. A mere Aramaic translation of our Lord's words in the Synoptists would have little scientific value; there must also be afforded a full glance into the meaning of the new text, and into the form which the exegetical problems now assume.

This is what Professor Dalman gives us in this volume, in which, besides the Introduction and an Appendix of Messianic texts from post-canonical Jewish literature, he discusses the most important of our Lord's words and ideas: the Kingdom (or rather reign) of God; the future æon; eternal life; the world; 'the Lord,' as a divine name; the Father in heaven; other divine names and ways of speaking of God; the Son of Man; the Son of God; the Christ; the Son of David; 'the Lord' and 'Master,' as names of Jesus.

In order that the readers of The Expository Times may be able to form some idea of the contents of this learned and instructive volume, I have condensed pp. 191–218 on 'The Son of man.' Readers of German should secure the volume for themselves. It throws much fresh light on every question of which it treats.

1. *The Linguistic Form of the Expression*, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. In biblical Hebrew the expression 'son of man' (in the singular), apart from its frequent use in Ezekiel and in Dn 8^{17} as a form

[1] *Die Worte Jesu* mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache erörtet von Gustaf Dalman, ao. Professor der Theologie in Leipzig. Band I. Einleitung und wichtige Begriffe, nebst Anhang: Messianische Texte. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. xv. 320. Price M.8.50.

of address, occurs very seldom. It is found only in poetical passages, when its use is occasioned by the parallelism, and means not 'the son of a man,' but a member of the genus man (*e.g.* Nu 23^{19}, Is 51^{12} 56^{2}, Jer $49^{18.\ 33}$, Ps 8^{5} 80^{18} 146^{3}, etc.). This is its meaning also in the Apocrypha (Jth 8^{16}, Sir 17^{30}) and in biblical Aramaic, where 'one like unto a son of man' (Dn 7^{13}) means one resembling a member of the genus man, and 'a man' is expressed by other terms (Dn 7^{4} 2^{25}). In the Mishna 'son of man' is not employed; the Targum of Onkelos follows generally the Hebrew text; and in the Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch it is found only in Nu 23^{19}. The Targum of the prophets has once 'son of man' instead of 'sons of men' (Mic 5^{6}, Eng. tr. v.^{7}); but elsewhere it follows the Hebrew text. In Aramaic inscriptions belonging to Palestine there is no single instance of its use. It is in Judæo-Galilæan and Christian-Palestinian Aramaic that we first find it used for 'a man'; it is occasionally so used also in the Jerusalem Targum of the Pentateuch (*e.g.* Nu 9^{13}), and twice in the Aramaic recension of the Book of Tobit.

We may, therefore, confidently affirm that in the Judæo-Palestinian Aramaic of the earlier period 'son of man' was unusual; that it was employed only in imitation of the Hebrew text, and that it was not the term for 'a man.' In earlier Judæo-Aramaic literature it is never found with the article (in the singular); 'the son of man' never occurs in the sense of 'the man,' which is always expressed otherwise. And this being the case with the Jews and the Samaritans, etc., we may assume that the Galilæans of our Lord's time formed no exception, and that the use of 'the son of man' = 'the man' in Judæo-Galilæan and Christian-Palestinian literature was an innovation.

Our Saviour's own words as reported in the Gospels are also worthy of notice. 'Men' in the singular and plural are very frequently spoken of; but *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* never occurs for 'man,' and *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* occurs only in Mk 3^{28}. If Jesus had always used only 'son of man' for 'man,' it is exceedingly improbable that the Hellenistic reporters of His words would have studiously avoided that expression, except when giving His own self-designation.

Nevertheless, Holtzmann calls it a 'discovery' that in Jesus' mother-tongue 'son of man' was the only term for 'man'; Wellhausen makes a similar statement; and Lietzmann asserts that Jesus could not have taken to Himself the title 'Son of man,' because such a title does not exist in Aramaic, and for linguistic reasons cannot exist. A conscientious study even of biblical Aramaic would have made such statements impossible.

When, therefore, the Aramaic for 'son of man' is determined by the article, it must be translated not 'the man,' but 'the son of man.' It was difficult, however, to render this Aramaic expression into Greek. The rendering in our Gospels is the product of great perplexity. It may, indeed, be regarded as the singular of *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, coined by the LXX for the Hebrew 'sons of men,' and found in Mk 3^{28}, Eph 3^{5}. But while the plural, 'the sons of men,' must mean men generally, both members of the expression received in the singular a strange emphasis. No help would have been found in *ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* which could only have meant 'the son of a man,' *ἄνθρωπος* not being a collective term. It would have been easiest to turn the Aramaic into *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*; but what misunderstandings this change of the uncommon original expression into a common one would have caused in the Gospels. They, therefore, preferred to reproduce the impression which 'Son of man,' with the article, produced in Aramaic, by the strongest determination possible of the compound Greek expression. They thus avoided the misunderstanding that only 'the man,' as man, was meant, and they also gained the possibility of a self-designation of Jesus by this expression. It is very probable, however, that the Hellenists from the first understood it, not in the Semitic, but in the Greek sense, as if Jesus thereby denoted Himself somehow on the human side as one 'sprung, descended, from men.' We can, therefore, easily understand that the Christian Hellenists avoided the expression as much as possible, and did not adopt it into their religious language. The original Aramaic could easily be employed as a special designation of a definite person; but it could not be rendered exactly either into Greek or into Syriac and Christian-Palestinian Aramaic.

2. *It was not a current Name for the Messiah.*—To the author of the Book of Daniel the 'one like unto a son of man' of 7^{13} is a personification of the 'people of the saints of the Most High' (v.^{27}),

who are one day to receive from God an imperishable world-dominion. In contrast with the beasts that come up from the sea, the symbols of the previous world-powers, he comes 'with,' or rather 'upon the clouds of heaven,' and symbolises the future possessors of world-dominion. He comes not from the earth, still less from the sea, but from heaven; he is a being standing near God, and well suited to typify the people of the saints of God. It is important to notice that nothing further is said of him than that he is man-like. He does not differ from the four beasts in that he alone has reason, for the first of these receives a man's heart (v.[4]), and the last of them has human eyes and can speak (v.[8]). As compared with the winged lion, the devouring bear, the four-headed leopard, and the ten-horned fourth beast, the most terrible of them all, he rather appears as unarmed, harmless, and incapable of taking possession of the world by his own power; he is only—like a son of man. If he is to become ruler of the world, it is God that must make him so.

The Similitudes of the Book of Enoch and 2 Esdras are the only known Jewish books of the first century A.D. that treat of Dn 7^{13}. They both make the 'one like unto a son of man' an individual, viz. the Messiah. The Similitudes sometimes call the Messiah 'that son of man,' sometimes only 'the son of man.' It is evident that 'son of man' is not assumed by the author to be a current Messianic title; but he himself certainly uses it in that sense. He always designates the mysterious being, who was never upon the earth and yet is not God, by this name.

The author of 2 Es 13 never uses the expression 'Son of man.' He calls the Messiah 'that man' (v.[3]), 'the man that came out of the sea' (vv.[5. 25. 51]), 'the same man' (v.[12]), 'my Son . . . whom thou sawest as a man ascending' (v.[32]). Though he intentionally makes the man-like being come up from the sea, the author undoubtedly refers to Dn 7. But a Messianic title could not be derived from the prosaic term 'man,' which he uses instead of 'son of man.'

Many Jewish authorities *after* the first century plainly assume the Messianic sense of Dn 7^{13}. There are evidences, however, that it was not universally so interpreted; *e.g.* according to an anonymous saying in a Midrash, the thrones in v.[9] are set for the magnates of Israel, who, with God at their head, will judge the nations (cf. Mt 19^{28}).

We may, therefore, sum up as follows:—The 'son of man' of Dn 7^{13} was occasionally understood of the Messiah; one apocalyptic piece of the early period gave the Messiah that and *no other name*; but it was not a current Jewish Messianic name. There was nothing to prevent it becoming so; but the Rabbis did not form their picture of the Messiah mainly from Dn 7.

3. *It was not a mere Figure of Speech.*—An old opinion has recently been revived that, at least in a number of cases, when Jesus called Himself the Son of man, this was merely a substitute, common among the Jews, for the first personal pronoun. But this custom, of speaking of oneself in the third person, was by no means universal among the Hebrews. And while there are certainly many instances of a Jew, speaking of himself, saying 'this man,' there is no example of 'this son of man' being so used. Indeed, such an example could hardly occur; for, as we have already seen, 'son of man' was not in Aramaic the common term for 'man.'

It can only be said that we need not be surprised if we find Jesus speaking of Himself in the third person. But the expression which He used in doing so was an unusual one, and requires a special explanation.

4. *As a Designation of Jesus it was used only by Himself.*—In all three Synoptists it is found only in His own mouth. John once (12^{34}) puts it into the mouth of the people. Stephen (Ac 7^{56}) and James (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23), when dying, use it; but in both cases there is an unmistakable allusion to the saying of Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Lk 22^{69}, Mt 26^{64}). He is nowhere else called the Son of man (except in the 'Liturgy of St. James,'), not even in the Apocalypse of St. John, although it speaks twice, with an allusion to Daniel, of one like unto a son of man (1^{13} 14^{14}). We must not infer from this that the author did not know that Jesus called Himself the Son of man; but he certainly refrained from using that designation as a name of Jesus.

In 1 Th 4^{16}, 2 Th 1^{7}, St. Paul, alluding to the corresponding sayings of Jesus regarding His return, calls Him not 'the Son of man,' but 'the Lord'; and in 1 Co $15^{47f.}$ he calls Christ 'the second man from heaven' and 'the heavenly one,' without any allusion to our Lord's self-designation.

That Jesus alone used of Himself this designation, is a fact that needs explanation. Some

recent writers maintain that it proves that Jesus Himself did not use it, and that there must have been somewhere a primitive Hellenistic Church that was fond of it, and made Jesus often speak of Himself in the third person, in order to find occasion for the employment of it. But from such a conjecture we should be deterred by the fact that, even yet, though the Gospels have for 1800 years proclaimed Jesus as 'the Son of Man,' this expression has not become a current designation of Christ, and that we speak in books and sermons of 'the Son of man' only when referring to Jesus' own words. Probably the same feeling that prevents us from doing so was keen from the very beginning.

Moreover, we can easily understand why, in the Greek-speaking Church, this designation of our Lord was avoided. Many of the Greek and Latin Fathers saw in it an allusion to the human side of the origin of Jesus; and, after what we have said at the close of No. 1, this need not surprise us. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου could not be understood by Greeks otherwise than of one, who gave himself out to be the son of a man. In the Greek-speaking Church such a name of Jesus could be employed in dogmatic discussions; but it was not suited for practical use.

5. *The meaning of the Designation to the Synoptists.*—In Mt it occurs first in 8^{20}; in Mk in 2^{10}; and in Lk in 5^{24}. None of them makes any attempt to explain the term. Had they wished their readers to think of the Messiah coming in the clouds of heaven, they would surely have used first an utterance in which the Messianic glory of the Son of man was expressed; but in Matthew the first saying is of the Son of man, who lacks that which even beasts have, and in Mark and Luke of the Son of man, who has authority to forgive sins on earth. They do not assume, however, that their readers will understand the latter statement as meaning that this power belongs to Jesus *quâ* 'the Son of man,' but that He, who calls Himself only 'the Son of man,' has received this authority (this is plainly implied in Mt 9^{8}). In the narrative of Peter's confession, Matthew, by the changes peculiar to him (16^{13} 'the Son of man' instead of 'I,' Mk 8^{27}, Lk 9^{18}; 'the Christ, the Son of the living God,' v.^{16}, for 'the Christ,' Mk 8^{29}, 'the Christ of God' Lk 9^{20}) makes it plain that He, who calls Himself only 'the Son of man,' is in reality the opposite of that, viz. God's Son. It is made prominent in 16^{17} that Peter has acquired this knowledge not from men, but from God. Jesus has manifestly not helped him to it by His self-designation as 'the Son of man.' Neither have Mark and Luke seen in this designation a way of indicating His Messianic dignity; His command to tell no one of His Messiahship (Mk 8^{30}, Lk 9^{21}, cf. Mt 16^{20}) would have seemed to them meaningless, if He had always publicly confessed Himself as the Messiah. There is also a hint that 'Son of man' denotes the Messiah, not in His glory, but in His lowliness, in what is said of the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit as compared with blaspheming the Son of man (Lk 12^{10}, Mt 12^{32}; in Mk $3^{28f.}$, the original form of the saying, the contrast is between blaspheming in general and blaspheming the Spirit, present in power in Jesus). Matthew and Luke cannot mean to distinguish between two persons of the Godhead, as if it were a venial sin to blaspheme the 'Son.' Jesus is rather distinguished *as man* from the divine Spirit working through Him; reviling of Jesus may be forgiven; blasphemy of the divine power in Him is unforgivable, because it is blasphemy of *God*.

We are, therefore, justified in saying that to the Synoptists, as to the early Church, 'the Son of man' was not a designation pointing to the glory of the Messiah, but (as it must necessarily have seemed to a Hellenist) an intentional disguising of Messiahship behind a name, which lays stress on the humanity of its bearer. To them it was not Jesus' sayings regarding the sufferings of 'the Son of man,' but those regarding His glory, that were paradoxes. What was marvellous was not that 'the Son of Man' should be put to death, but that He should return on the clouds of heaven.

6. *How Jesus Himself understood the Designation.*—Seeing that He nowhere explains its meaning, we must first study the expression itself, and then consider it along with the witness He bore to His person.

It is exceedingly likely that Jesus derived this strange designation from the Old Testament, in which a similar expression occurs (*in Aramaic*, the language spoken by Jesus) only in Dn 7^{13}. But His Jewish hearers would not necessarily have understood Him as claiming to be the Messiah; for, as we have already seen, Dn 7^{13} was not interpreted by everyone in a Messianic sense. Besides, it spoke of one like unto a son of man coming with (or on) the clouds of heaven, in order to

become lord of the world. This could not be said of Jesus. To one who did not know that He actually spoke of His death, resurrection, and glorious return, a reference to Dn 7 would probably have seemed impossible, and His self-designation enigmatical. His hearers could only have inferred that for some reason or other He looked upon Himself as a man above (*i.e.* more than) others. But no *Jew* could have imagined that He meant 'the ideal man' in any sense whatever.

It cannot be doubted, however, that Jesus drew this self-designation from Dn 7^{13} (cf. Mt 24^{30} 26^{64} and parallels). He merely meant by it that He was the one in whom that vision in Daniel was being fulfilled. But certainly all His hearers did not perceive this connexion between the name He gave Himself and the Book of Daniel; there was a time when even His disciples did not perceive it. Why, then, did He so name Himself in the hearing of persons ignorant of that connexion? Did He actually use the expression when speaking to such?

It is very difficult to answer these questions with certainty. In the first place, none of the Gospels reports His sayings in exact chronological order; and in this respect they often differ from one another. Secondly, the recollection of His disciples as to the use of the expression 'Son of man' could not have been infallible; it is not conceivable that they remembered exactly in which sayings He used it, and in which not. It is found in Mt 16^{13}, but not in the parallels, Mk 8^{27}, Lk 9^{18}; in Lk 6^{22} 12^{8}, but not it Mt 5^{11} 10^{33}; in Mk 10^{45} and Mt 20^{28}, but not in Lk 22^{27}; in Mk 8^{31} and Lk 9^{22}, but not in Mt 16^{21}. Such being the state of the case, we cannot be certain when first, and before what persons, Jesus used the name 'the Son of man.'

The evangelists seem to be of opinion that He did so always, and in the hearing of everyone. His first use of it in Mk (2^{10}) and Lk (5^{24}) is in public; in Mt (8^{20}) He first uses it when speaking to one not yet a disciple. In such cases He could not have expected to be understood by His hearers. It may be said that He purposely spoke to them in a riddle, which would lead them to meditate on His person; but if, from the beginning, He called Himself 'the Son of man,' His disciples would almost certainly have asked and obtained from Him an explanation of the expression. That they had not done so before Peter's confession is plain from Mt 16^{17}, as well as from the command in Mk 8^{30}, Lk 9^{21}, to say nothing to the people of His Messianic dignity. He cannot have previously avowed Himself as the Messiah in a manner thoroughly transparent to His disciples. Accordingly, the teaching regarding His Messiahship, which Matthew reports before Peter's confession ($13^{36\text{-}43}$ $7^{21\text{-}23}$; cf. Lk 6^{46}, which does not speak of Jesus as Judge of the world; also Mt $10^{17\text{-}25}$), must be placed after that event, more especially as it assumes His future absence from the disciples, and therefore His death. In Mk (8^{38}) and Lk (9^{26}) His first saying regarding His coming in glory is found after Peter's confession and the open announcement of His death. It is probable, therefore, though not *absolutely certain*, that He had not previously called Himself 'the Son of man.'

A careful study of the Synoptists justifies this assertion. In Matthew 'the Son of man' occurs nine times before Peter's confession. Of four of these occasions we have already spoken (8^{20} 10^{23} $13^{37.\ 41}$); 12^{32} is an explanatory doublet of v.^{31} (cf. Mk $3^{28f.}$); and 12^{40} is put by Lk (11^{30}) after Peter's confession. There remain only three instances in which there is evidence of the use of 'the Son of man' before that confession, viz., Mt $11^{18f.}$ (Lk $7^{33f.}$) 9^{6} (Mk 2^{10}, Lk 5^{24}) and 12^{8} (Mk 2^{28}, Lk 6^{5}).

Several modern expositors get rid of two of these passages (Mt 9^{6} 12^{8}) by assuming that Jesus speaks in them only of man generally, or of Himself *as a man*. With reference to Mt 9^{6}, J. Weiss says it would have been absurd to prove that 'the Son of Man,' *i.e.* the Messiah, had power to forgive sins, because 'none of Jesus' opponents doubted that the Messiah had such power.' But His opponents would hardly have understood 'Son of man' as a Messianic designation; and it is a fact, which J. Weiss ought to know, that Judaism has never, from the Old Testament to the present day, dared to ascribe such power to the Messiah. And Mt 9^{8} only shows how the evangelist himself understood the expression (see above, No. 5).

It might be said with more apparent justice of Mt 12^{8} that 'Son of man' means man generally, more especially as, according to Mk 2^{27}, man has just been described as the aim of the Sabbath. But Mark alone has this latter sentence; Matthew has instead of it something different, while Luke has nothing corresponding. Mk 2^{27} is an insertion parallel to Mt $12^{5\text{-}7}$. The saying regarding the

lord of the Sabbath was probably an independent *logion*, which was added to this section of the Gospel story only because of its similarity in meaning. Jesus said merely that, just as in the well-known case of David, necessity justified the action of His disciples, not that He, as lord of the Sabbath, had authorized their action. And taking even Mark's text as it stands, we must remember (cf. No. 1) that in Aramaic 'son of man' was not the term for 'man.' If it were so employed here, how are we to account for the fact that 'man' is called ὁ ἄνθρωπος in v.[27], but ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in v.[28]?

It is a simpler and more legitimate way of getting rid of these passages, to put them after Peter's confession. In all three Synoptists the section in question has in its midst the saying regarding the absence of the bridegroom, which will lead his comrades to fast (Mt 9^{15}, Mk 2^{20}, Lk 5^{35}). Here Jesus presupposes His death; and though it is by no means made out that it was only after Peter's confession that He gained the knowledge of His violent end, it seems that it was only after that event that He spoke of it to His disciples. From that time onwards the name 'Son of man' would be transparent to *them* as the designation, derived from Dn 7^{13}, of the one destined to be the ruler of the world. But to the multitude He did not disclose the full meaning of the term till, with His open confession before the Sanhedrin (Mt 26^{64}, Mk 14^{62}, Lk 22^{69}), He removed every doubt, and thereby gave to His judges the possibility of delivering Him up to death.

It is only with the help of the Book of Daniel that we can discover the precise meaning that Jesus attached to this designation of Himself. The decisive reason why He fell back upon Daniel and his designation of the future ruler of the world, was because nowhere else is it stated so clearly that the necessary transformation of all conditions on earth is to be looked for from God alone (cf. Dn $2^{34.35}$ $7^{13f.27}$ 11^{14}). He had seen in Galilee how self-help led to no successful issue; and He willed not to be regarded as 'Messiah' by the people, because they expected from their Messiah political emancipation, and a violent snatching of dominion to Himself. For another reason also, the designation 'the Son of Man' was appropriate for Jesus. The name 'Messiah' denoted the ruler of the time of redemption *quâ* ruler; it was appropriate for the destined person only when he had ascended the throne, and not before he had done so. In point of fact, a suffering and dying of the actual possessor of the Messianic dignity is, according to the testimony of the prophets, inconceivable. When Jesus attached to the confession of Peter the first announcement of His violent death, He did so in order to make it plain that His sovereignty was still remote, and that *His* Messiahship, instead of including, excluded all self-help. The 'one like unto a son of man' of Dn 7^{13} is, however, one who has yet to receive his dominion. He *may* also be one who has to pass through suffering and death. He is certainly no powerful one, no conqueror, no destroyer; he is only 'a human being,' whom God has taken under His protection and destined to great things. And Jesus calls Himself 'the Son of man,' not as the 'lowly' one, but as the naturally weak human being, whom God will make Lord of the world (cf. Ps $8^{4f.}$, also the use of τὸ ἀρνίον, 'the lambkin,' for Christ, in Rev.).

If this interpretation of the expression is correct, it follows—(1) that Jesus' way of apprehending the designation was peculiar to Himself, and not derived from Enoch or 2 Esdras; (2) that lowliness and suffering, as well as majesty, might be predicated of 'the Son of man'; (3) that the meaning, which the term had for those who did not divine its connexion with Dn 7, was no erroneous one, seeing that they also must have gathered from it that Jesus had no intention of being a self-raised usurper; (4) that it was *possible* that even the disciples were satisfied from the first with this interpretation of it, and asked no further explanation from Jesus; (5) that the way in which the Hellenistic Synoptists and the early Church understood the expression was not erroneous, so far as they saw in it a confession by Jesus of His humanity; and (6) that the Church was also right in being unwilling to make use of the designation; for since 'the human being' has seated Himself upon God's throne, He is, in point of fact, no longer only a man, but a Ruler over heaven and earth, 'the Lord,' as Paul in the Epistles to the Thessalonians rightly calls Him, who comes with the clouds of heaven.

Requests and Replies.

What is the correct rendering of the word translated 'swelling' in Jer. xii. 5, xlix. 19, l. 44? I have seen it translated 'thicket,' but the root-idea seems to be 'pride.' See Prov. xvi. 18; Ps. lix. 12?—PRESBYTER.

THE word *ga'ôn* is derived from a verb *ga'ah*, signifying *to be high*, or *to grow high*, either literally, as Job 8^{11} (of the reed), Ezk 47^{5}, or metaphorically, *be proud*, *triumph*, etc. Hence the word is rendered in A.V. by *pride*, *excellency*, *majesty*, and often *pomp*. It seems to be applied to the luxuriant splendour or pomp of the vegetation about the Jordan in contrast to the bare aridity inland. Of course the word does not *mean* 'thicket,' but is a term applied to the thickets. The A.V. rendering 'swelling' has arisen from the assumption that the word applied to the *waters* of the Jordan. This might very well be so far as usage goes; cf. Ezk 47^{5}, Job 38^{11}; but this sense does not suit the figure of the lion coming up (Jer 49^{19}; cf. Zec 11^{3}). A. B. DAVIDSON.

Edinburgh.

I hazard as an explanation of the seemingly unmeaning combination in Isa. xii. 2, xxvi. 4, יה יהוה, 'Yah, Yahve,' that the second and fuller form of the sacred name had originally been inserted in the margin as explanatory of the shorter and less familiar form, and that from the margin it has crept into the text. What, I think, gives probability to the conjecture is that Isa. xii. 2 is copied from the song of Moses in Ex. xv. 2, where the shorter form יָהּ alone is found. Has this been suggested before?—R. M. SPENCE.

Manse of Arbuthnott.

DR. SPENCE'S suggestion is an old one. Houbigant long ago proposed to omit יה. In my *Proph. Is.* I omitted יה in 12^{2}, but by an oversight kept it in 26^{4}. In *Isaiah*, *SBOT*, 1898, p. 126, this inconsistency is removed. The Hebrew edition, delayed year after year, till the additions make the original work almost antiquated, should be out next month: so at least Dr. Haupt promises.

Oxford. T. K. CHEYNE.

I see that in 1 Cor. iv. 4, instead of 'I know nothing by myself,' the Revised Version offers, 'I know nothing against myself.' Will you tell one unacquainted with Greek, if that is due to a different Greek reading? It seems to alter the meaning completely.—T. S.

THE change is not due to a difference in the Greek translated, nor does it alter the meaning. It is simply due to the fact that in the Authorized Version 'by' is used in the obsolete sense of 'against.' The passage is explained in the *Dictionary of the Bible* under BY. To the examples there given of 'by' with the meaning of 'against,' may be added the following:—Barlowe (*Dialoge*, Lunn's edition, p. 36), speaking of the Reformers, says, 'And be ye full assured that I reherse not by a greate parte all the abuses manyfestlye knowen by them.' Cranmer (*Works*, i. 165) writes to Henry VIII. about Queen Anne Boleyn, 'I am exceeding sorry that such faults can be proved by the Queen, as I heard of their relation'; and in another letter (p. 170) he says, 'the Prior . . . said openly to me in a good audience, that he knew no vices by the Bishops of Rome.' Latimer (*Sermons*, Arber's ed. p. 115) refers to this very passage in 1 Co, 'Paule woulde not prayse hym selfe to hys owne justification, and therefore when they hadde spoken these thynges by him, I passe not all, sayth he, what ye saye by me.' Lever (*Sermons*, Arber's ed. p. 137) renders the passage, 'For there is nothyng that I knowe my selfe gylty of'; and then (p. 138) shows how others abuse the saying, 'They saye, they passe lytle what any man saythe by them, meaning therby that though all men fynde fautes wyth theim, yet wyll they never be ashamed of theyr evyll doynge.' It is worth noticing that not long ago a preacher in a university pulpit chose this passage as the text of a sermon directed against private judgment. He was not understood to be wilfully abusing his text, but only to be ignorant of both Greek and English.

EDITOR.

The Responsibility of Self-Assertion.

A STUDY IN TWO CHARACTERS.

By the Rev. James Moffatt, B.D., Dundonald.

'Look on me and do likewise . . . and it shall be that as I do, so shall ye do.'—Judg. vii. 17.[1]

'Be ye imitators together of me.'—Phil. iii. 17.

'The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do.'—Phil. iv. 9.

These words of the leaders to the led rest upon a law that underlies the average character. Most people have at some time or other to assert themselves. For the sake of others and at any risk of misconception, it is their duty to emphasize their personalities as the media of certain truths, to lay special stress upon their individual habits and hopes, to give unwonted prominence to their own characters, to insist uncompromisingly and modestly upon attention to what they say and obedience to what they order. The reasons and methods vary. Either the influence is the immediate magnetism of a personality, for practical conduct in a crisis (Jg 7 *passim*), or it is the more delicate though not necessarily less potent call through memory and admiration (Ph 3 and 4) to reproduce a spirit and a character. Similarly, the recognition of this duty depends in general upon a steady consciousness of one's position at a given time and in given circumstances. A man may find himself to be the strongest person there and then, *ipso facto* responsible for guiding the conduct and shaping the minds of others. But this firm estimate of oneself would rush into open-air, sturdy natures, like that of Gideon, without analysis of motives. More reflective minds, such as Paul's, even if they happen to be naturally imperious, come to assert themselves only along some process of inward reasoning. Still, for all the varieties, there is no doubt as to the reality and value and difficulty of the attitude. The psychological fact stands, that one may be drawn to do a certain deed by observing its performance in another's life. Conversely, in the spheres of practical conduct and the formation of character—Gideon and Paul are instances—aid for other men might be withheld were there a refusal to enforce one's claim and assert one's vital influence. Where self-assertion is a condition of assistance and a method of service, undue modesty passes into a positive temptation. Certainly the world abounds in caricatures of self-assertion. The very word is justly shadowed through its connexion with domineering, pretentious egotism, and it is small wonder that the spirit which it represents should be frequently misunderstood and avoided. But only weak people are frightened away from truth by its caricatures. Indubitably an ethical truth lies behind the term 'self-assertion.' Possibly it is a primitive lever to exert on others, but it is a lever, and as the main point is to get conscience and will moved, the use of this method is quite a legitimate function for the stronger nature.[2] Self-assertion helps the weaker to realize certain duties. It puts an ideal into the concrete. Consequently many who would remain motionless before a claim presented in more abstract form are roused by the effectiveness and attractiveness of duty in the persuasive guise of flesh and blood. This is obviously true of hero-worship, the extreme form of self-assertion, and its consequences. But the moderate, various forms — sentiments of loyalty, admiration, esteem—are equally energetic, and cannot be thrown aside as merely primitive. They are characteristic of certain types of susceptibility, and it is primarily through them that duty is very often conceived and executed. Hence to stimulate these forms and feelings is a sound part of human responsibility.

Often the responsibility lies in the exigencies of the case. In the primitive age of these Hebrew tribal chiefs each hero stood for and by himself in his own district. The sphere was local. Israel was broken up into particular clans and groups,

[1] מָמֶּנִּי תִרְאוּ וְכֵן תַּעֲשׂוּ 17a, a curt order with an emphasis on the first word: Moore renders it, 'Learn your part from me by observing what I do.'

[2] Jg 5$^{2.\ 9a}$—

'For that the leaders took the lead in Israel,
For that the people offered themselves willingly,
Bless ye Yahveh.
My heart is toward the governors of Israel,
That offered themselves willingly among the people.'

each of which evidently depended upon the special exertions and ability of its own leader, and for the central territory Gideon became responsible. To carry his work through he required from others a common spirit of loyalty and a somewhat lofty character. For this standard, as the narrative implies,—Hebrew religion being at the moment 'immature' and 'unstable'[1] generally,—the Manassite leader had nowhere to point save to himself. The difficulty of religious patriotism, the paucity of awakened consciences, the comparatively isolated nature of the clans, demanded this self-emphasis. It was through imitation of his own forceful actions, as a clear object-lesson, that the conscience of the loth could alone be raised and trained. Gideon, like Wolfe, most probably

> where'er he fought,
> Put so much of his heart into his act,
> That his example had a magnet's force,
> And all were swift to follow whom all loved.

But this unconscious attraction was backed by the conscious call (7^{17}) to a like process. For special crises ordinary natures need such vigorous definite challenges to their will and heart. The competing forces of custom (Jg 8^{6} etc.) are strong: the disinclination to make a change, the obstinate desire to let things alone, the inability to act on one's personal initiative, these and other obstacles thwart every movement like that of Gideon's. If it is to be achieved, the supreme method is enthusiasm for a cause robed in a personality. In a great reform of manners or opinion, the many are usually sensitive to the decisive will and mind of him who does not scruple to declare: 'Do what I do and you do God's work. Help me and you are helping Him.' Only thus are the well-meaning spurred into energetic co-operation.

Similarly in the case of general character. In the seventh decade of the first Christian century, with the N.T. yet unwritten, the living ideal of the Christ-life was far from being stereotyped in words or habits. Fluid and free, its appeal had to come largely through men's experience and observation of one another, and the inevitable reproduction of character (Ph 3^{17}). The channel of education was chiefly the seen or remembered character of definite individuals, the advice and conduct of the best people (Heb 13^{7}). Probably for each community one or two, dead or living, absent or present, represented the ideal of the Christian spirit. Acquaintance with these became a standard and stimulus to the rest, who were thus enabled to preserve some sense of definiteness, cohesion, and actuality in their ideas of the faith. Paul was perfectly aware his friends were surrounded in Philippi by other and opposing types of character, not merely pagan, but semi-Christian (Ph $3^{18, 19}$). Such ideals were fascinating, close, solid. His own, he knew, was yet uncommon; if it was to become through memory (1^{30}) and admiration any power, it required emphasis and repetition. Hence, under the circumstances, there was no alternative save to point men to their impressions and memories of himself. He had to stand for a palpable ideal of Christianity. In view of outside competing claims, to reproduce the Christian character demanded an effort (*συνμιμηταὶ γίνεσθε*) against inward indolence and reluctance.[2] Obviously, to aid this struggling aspiration by means of his own vivid and consistent character became for the apostle a sensible, clear line of mission. He was charged more than ever with the task of making visible[3] in himself the new spirit and distinctiveness of Christian experience, until it became permanent, intelligible, and attractive by itself to others. And for all the popularization of the Christian ideal since the first century, this function —representing pretty much what is covered by the old Hebrew phrase, 'to be made a god to' a person (*e.g.* Ex 7^{1})—has not yet become an anachronism. According to the sincerity and richness of his character, each man still stands to some others authoritatively for a more or less large portion of the ideal. The further bearing of the principle upon education, friendship, and religion is sufficiently obvious; instances of these surround us in all spheres.

The natural scruples which are started by any counsel of this kind run in two directions. Self-assertion is charged with pride. But pride is merely the accompanying risk, not the inevitable element, of genuine self-assertion, and men like Gideon and Paul are stamped for the most part with a simple, firm modesty in their services. This is plainly noted in the records. Gideon

[1] Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 58. Professor Davidson calls the period 'the workshop in which the nation, as we know it, was fashioned' (*Expositor*, 3rd series, vol. v. p. 54).

[2] Cf. Heb 6^{12}, *ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, μιμηταὶ δὲ, κ.τ.λ.*

[3] 'Through such souls alone
God stooping shows sufficient of His light
For us i' the dark to rise by. And I rise.'

built his altar to and named it after Yahweh (Jg 6^{24}). Once sure of its divinity, he accepted his commission. His 'signs' are proof of a certain reliance upon Yahweh in the earlier moments of despondency (6^{13}), which was not lost in the later flush of personal success (8^{7}). In both narratives the religious significance of the call is marked (6^{34} with 6^{14-16}); his war-cry is "יהוה וגו (7^18). And this conception of his character is touched by implication in the later literature.[1] Even this stalwart, rude chief was held to have wrought his work διὰ πίστεως,[2] sensitive to the need as to the control of a divine Will in his career. All over, the conception of his character, even in the Book of the Judges, shows no remarkable trace of self-pretension. Paul equally guarded himself against the suspicion of arrogance, deliberately (καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ, 1 Co 11^{1}) or inferentially (as here, *vide* the context and the close of the paragraph in 4^{1}, οὕτως ἐν κυρίῳ). Curiously enough, his commission is almost verbally identical with that of Gideon.[3] Also, their resource of power is common,[4] deliberate obedience to the unseen, and this does not easily succumb to pride before men. The fact is, most people are apt to shrink from 'asserting' themselves, not so much because it outrages their fine modesty, as from the depressing sense of incongruity. To direct attention to their personal lives would be to court ridicule. They are conscious of inspiring neither respect nor any thrilling admiration, thanks to the trivial, inconsistent character which they actually possess. Hence they fear, and fear justly, the obvious retort. Genuine self-assertion is impossible to the majority, not through their humility, but through their moral poverty. Hesitation and scruples on this line are more often the result of conscious failure than the fear of subtle pride. As the characters of Gideon and Paul imply, the best safeguard against the self-important spirit is the sheer sense of responsibility for oneself and others. Definite, practical dependence upon a higher Will and Power furnishes the natural salvation from pharisaism. Besides, pride is impossible in regard to objects which are common to all, and these two men persistently refuse to be considered exceptional. 'Brilliant' and 'unique' are not the adjectives for their lives; they are not content to pose upon an altitude impossible to the rank and file. Evidently they indicate their vigour and attainments are the effect of Another's life which is being brought to emphasis in them specially in order that others may recognize its real nature, and believe it lies open equally to themselves. That is the condition, as it is the object, of self-assertion, to interpret and mediate for others a universal possession.[5]

This answers by anticipation the companion-scruple which charges self-assertion with barrenness. Sincerely practised for the will and in the work of Another it is not vain. Such obedience carries a power in it. As a matter of fact those whose confidence comes through loyalty to God are the people who win confidence and loyalty from others. Gideon drew after him a company (Jg 6^{27} 7^{8}), and Paul's power of attracting younger men to himself is patent. Already he had, as we say, a school (*e.g.* ἡμᾶς Ph 3^{17}) of sympathetic (1 Co 4^{17}) followers. In self-assertion he had absolute confidence; it had been his method from the first (1 Th 1^{6}), and long ago his power of impressing others had produced results which were accepted facts (2 Th 3^{7}). 'Where he did such good work,' writes Mr. Meredith, outlining the character of a youthful leader, 'was in sharpening the fellows to excel, . . . and it was not done by exhortations off a pedestal, like St. Paul at the Athenians, it breathed out of him every day of the week. He carried a light for followers. Whatever he demanded of them, he himself did it easily.' But neither in Athens nor elsewhere does Paul seem to

[1] Ecclus 46^{11}—

'Also the judges, every one by his name,
All whose hearts went not a-whoring,
And who turned not away from the Lord.'

[2] Heb 11^{32-33}, 'Gideon was the best ruler that could be found—the noblest in character, most prompt, and yet efficient in word and deed; formed for rule, yet without lust of rule; preferring renunciation, and yielding to the higher duties of religion.'—EWALD.

[3] Jg 6^{14}, Πορεύου . . . ἰδοὺ ἐξαπεστειλά σε (LXX) = Ac 22^{21}, πορεύου, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐξαποστελῶ σε.

[4] Jg 6^{34}, Καὶ πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐνεδυνάμωσεν τὸν Γεδεών = Ph 4^{13}, πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με. Cf. Ac 9^{22}, Σαῦλος δὲ μᾶλλον ἐδυναμοῦτο. One might compare also the decisive iconoclasm (Jg 6^{25-30} = Ac 17^{29}, 1 Co $8^{4.5}$) and unflagging perseverance of the two men (Jg 8^{4}, πεινῶντες καὶ διώκοντες with Ph 4^{12} 3^{12}, διώκω δὲ . . . μεμύημαι, καὶ χορτάζεσθαι καὶ πεινᾶν).

[5] Students of English literature will recognize the same principle applied by Carlyle to politics (*Chartism*, ch. vi.), Ruskin to art (*Modern Painters*, III. iv. 10, § 19), Faber to the Roman office of spiritual director (*Growth in Holiness*, ch. xviii.), and Martineau to the ethics of influence (*Study of Religion*, ii. pp. 29–33).

have been addicted to the pedestal-method. Otherwise his self-assertion would have missed effectiveness. His power, like that of Gideon, lay mostly in a serene self-confidence born of personal devotion to the cause and of a measure of achievement: ἔχετε τυπού, as he told others, the personal standard[1] was plain, common, verifiable. Where advice is backed in this way by a consistently advancing character, it becomes as nearly irresistible as any force may be in the field of human nature.

Such scruples, in fact, merely emphasize the pressing need of care for the personal life. Self-assertion is worse than futile unless it comes out of a long unselfish career with a transparent devotion, and this fact touches these special indispensable points in the two characters now under discussion: (*a*) a scrupulous desire to know God and do his will, to have no by-ends or private ambitions, to have an honest, adequate theory of one's career (Ph 1^{20-25}), and to be concerned for and sure of God's presence in life (cf. Gideon's 'signs'); (*b*) a growing experience to which others can be called (Ph 3^{7-16}), or some heroic sense of the undone (Jg 7, 8). The measure of a man's power over others depends on this sense of personal inadequacy and passion for growth. The magnetic life is the life which is being changed, responding to new calls and higher visions for itself before it goes out to impose any upon others; (*c*) decisiveness in the central vital points. Between flexible consideration for others and the sense of personal shortcoming, the unfaltering convictions have to be kept strong: Gideon knew and took his course, Paul had his line of action (Ph $3^{8.\,13-14}$ 4^{9} πράσσετε). Not long ago Mr. Frederic Harrison expressed his wonder that in an age of such large transitions as our own a man of so little elasticity as the late Canon Liddon should have wielded such considerable power. The answer probably lies in the inherent authority of conviction—apart sometimes from the quality of its contents—over many minds. Severe, unfaltering, urgent decisiveness exerts a charm of quite exceptional strength; (*d*) unselfish interest in others: *vide* Gideon's brooding over the Hebrew wrongs (Jg $6^{13.\,37}$ with 8^{35}) and Paul's generous affection (Ph $1^{24.\,25}$ $2^{17.\,18}$). These four qualities, with the addition perhaps of unostentatious diligence (2 Th 3^{7}, Jg $6^{11.\,12}$), constitute the preparation for successful 'self-assertion.' Upon this good conscience depends the courage, the moral fearlessness with which a man can point to his own character, if need be, or allow it to be noticed and discussed (Mt 5^{14-16}), not afraid of a reasonable scrutiny, and superbly confident of its influential results.[2]

This courage is a further phase, however. The inner goodness may quite well exist without the completing step by which one takes his place thus openly in relation to other men, for the latter is often a perfect trial and compulsion. Still it is a vocation. In Gideon's unsophisticated nature no such traces of reluctance appear, and Paul seems untouched—so far as extant records go—by any scruples or need of self-conquest on this point. 'If he were not sure that he was a great man, he was at least sure that he was one set apart to do great things.'[3] Stevenson is speaking of John Knox, and he proceeds thus aptly: 'There may be something more finely sensitive in the modern humour, that tends more and more to withdraw a man's personality from the lessons he inculcates or the cause that he has espoused; but there is a loss herewith of wholesome responsibility; and when we find in the works of Knox, as in the epistles of Paul, the man himself standing nakedly forward, courting and anticipating criticism, putting his character, as it were, in pledge for the sincerity of his doctrine, we had best waive the question of delicacy, and make our acknowledgments for a lesson of courage, not unnecessary in these days of anonymous criticism, and much light, otherwise unattainable, on the spirit in which great movements were initiated and carried forward.' Either after or against this vindication there is little left that need be said.

At the same time self-assertion has its limits, and is responsible for observing them. The charge is often levelled against the strong characters of the world, like Augustine, Calvin, and Loyola, that they are too ambitious to have others cast in their own mould, sacrificing individuality to a single imperious type. This is a real danger, and it is fostered by the easy contentment of many people in a blind obedience or a false submission to more powerful wills. To live thus among second-hand views is to be losing the soul. Complete deference even to the dominion of a good person is ultimately a paralysis. Consequently it is necessary

[1] Cf. his reply and challenge to Agrippa (Ac 26^{29}).

[2] *E.g.* Ph 4^{9}, καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν, καὶ = and so.

[3] *Men and Books*, pp. 334, 335.

that individuality be respected[1] and its value enhanced. No mere *ipse dixit* will suffice. Self-assertion really implies a more or less intelligent imitation (Ph 4[9]), and that even in the case of practical energy:—the ideas and the scope of Gideon's clever military scheme, for example, were not merely imposed on others as authoritative, but explained in part to them (Jg 7[16-18]). A true relation of this kind involves on the side of the recipient a constant effort and desire to understand, and upon the side of the stronger nature a scrupulous provision and care to prevent the extinction or undue suppression of the other's genuine self. In this way self-assertion, by its very success, may become eventually superfluous in a given direction, as the weaker character is lifted to the other's level, and enabled to think and act without continuous incitement or instruction from the outside. Such at least is the goal of true development. Self-assertion must be counted educative and provisional. 'Faut-il toujours que l'on nous avertisse et ne pouvons-nous tomber à genoux que si quelqu'un est là pour nous dire que Dieu passe?' Consequently the responsibility for self-assertion covers the need not only of understanding where and how to exert this influence of personality, but also of determining the suitable occasions upon which it should be withheld, and the particular individuals to whom its unrestrained action might become a source of moral weakness. For if this ascendency of the higher over the lower experience is to be a genuine factor in the latter's moral growth, the pressure must be healthy: that is to say, of sincere intention, but also and especially, timely chosen.

[1] *E.g.* Ph 3[15. 16], καὶ εἴ τι ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Rothe Centenary.

In The Expository Times for May the Rev. David Eaton called attention to some of the more important publications which have appeared in connexion with the celebration of Rothe's hundredth birthday. Two pamphlets[1] recently issued contain full reports of the memorial addresses delivered by Dr. Tröltsch and Dr. Lemme; an interesting account is also given by Dr. Lemme of the origin of the movement to erect a permanent memorial to the famous Heidelberg theologian. During the thirty years that have intervened since Rothe's death other names have become prominent, and it is rightly regarded as a proof of the widespread and permanent influence of his teaching that the response to the appeal for funds should have been so general and so generous as to enable the committee to establish a Prize Fund, as well as to carry out their original design of placing a marble bust of Rothe in St. Peter's Church, where he so often preached.

Happily, some attempts to use the celebration for party purposes were frustrated. In the committee's appeal it is recognized that few would be in absolute agreement with all the details of Rothe's teaching, for, on the one hand, as a mediating theologian he is still regarded by many conservative Lutherans as heterodox, whilst, on the other hand, to more liberal thinkers his supernaturalism and belief in miracles are a stumbling-block. The result has proved that many who would not call themselves disciples of Rothe, and who represent opposing schools of thought, have been glad to unite in doing honour to the memory of one who was an original, stimulating, and reverent thinker, whose boldest inquiries were conducted in a truly pious spirit, and whose independent research has cast light upon many problems of theology, Church history, and ethics.

Dr. Tröltsch's address was delivered in the Aula of Heidelberg University, and is remarkable for its suggestive description of the life and times of Rothe. Born in the golden age of German literature, when the Romanticism of the Weimar school was beginning to unite with the speculative

[1] *Richard Rothe's Hundertjahrfeier.* Denkschrift des Rothe-Denkmal-Komites. Heidelberg: Gustav Köster. *Richard Rothe.* Gedächtnissrede gehalten von Dr. Ernst Tröltsch, z. Z. Dekan der theologischen Fakultät zu Heidelberg. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr.

philosophy of Kant, he was surrounded in his father's house by the influences of rational morality, and of the new learning; there he learnt that Rationalism is 'bad theology, but not a bad religion,' there also his imaginative faculties were stimulated not only by the writings of Goethe, Schiller, and, above all, of Novalis, but also by his father, who left behind more than a hundred poems; 'I confess,' he writes later in life, 'that I belong to the school of dreamers, but at the same time I warn everyone against the idea that dreaming is easy work.'

In his youth the strong religious tendencies of Rothe's nature became manifest: there is no trace of any conflict in his mind between faith and unbelief, his difficulties arose from his endeavours to unite the various elements of his mental and spiritual life. 'He is one of those rare natures who in the religious crisis of our day never had any doubts of a supernatural revelation to men of the Divine redemption.' In the spring of 1817 Rothe began his theological studies at Heidelberg, where his historical sense was aroused by the lectures of Schlosser and Creuzer, and where Daub and Hegel taught him the speculative method of philosophy. Passing from Heidelberg to Berlin, he came under the influence of Schleiermacher, but was even more powerfully attracted to Neander; there too he was brought into contact with the Pietists, in intercourse with whom his own religious experience was deepened, and from whom he learnt so to reverence the Bible that ever afterwards it was to him in spite of all criticism 'an essentially authentic record of an absolutely supernatural history, and a prophecy of the final destiny of the human race.'

Rothe's appointment in 1822 to the chaplaincy of the Prussian embassy in Rome marks an important epoch in his religious development. In the Roman Catholic Church he saw the realization of the ideal, but also the revelation of the inevitable dangers of ecclesiastical organization; it was also at this time that he became conscious of the gulf which separated his religious from his intellectual life. The ideals of his youth awoke in him again, with the result that he came to the twofold conclusion that Christianity was entering upon a new phase of its development which would be characterized by the union of the new learning with the Christian faith, and that the cause of the discord between culture and faith was the Church, which had isolated religion from the intellectual life of men. Henceforth a fundamental thought in his teaching was the merely transitory significance of the Church, with its dogmas and rites, as compared with the eternal significance of the ethical and religious contents of Christianity.

Dr. Tröltsch dwells at length on Rothe's historic conception of the past, present, and future of Christianity; his theological and philosophical view of the world and of the purpose of life; and his practical contribution to the solution of Church problems of the present day.

Dr. Lemme's address was delivered at the unveiling of Rothe's bust, and forms an admirable supplement to the biographical sketch of Dr. Tröltsch. The life-work of Rothe is described with sympathy and insight from many points of view, whilst a thoughtful analysis of his teaching is combined with a judicious estimate of the influence of his writings upon the life and thought of Germany. The keynote of his preaching is struck in one of his sermons where he says that in speaking of Christianity he means nothing less than a personal relation of the believer to the glorified Saviour; it is characteristic, however, of the spirit which pervades all his teaching that he should describe belief in the historic Jesus as a stepping-stone to true Christianity, although as compared with belief in the living Christ he declares it to be only half Christianity.

The paradoxes and heterodoxies of Rothe's system are acknowledged; there was in him a strange 'mixture of implicit faith and unbelief,' yet he always strove to find for his speculations the support of Holy Scripture, whose authority he recognized as binding. His desire was to render Christianity intelligible to non-Christians by an appeal to universally recognized principles of thought, and in Dr. Lemme's view it is possible to agree with Rothe that the Christian view of the world is capable of and demands a foundation in speculative thought, whilst granting that in his *Ethics* the metaphysician who strives to comprehend the world from his idea of the Absolute is at variance with the theologian who bases his arguments on facts, and teaches that evil is a reality, and that the redemption is a historic event.

These two pamphlets may be heartily recommended to all who have found Rothe's thoughts to be fruitful seed, and who desire to know more

of the man and his work, but who have not time to read the larger treatise of Holtzmann.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

König on 'Deutero-Isaiah.'[1]

IN view of the enormous amount of recent literature on Deutero-Isaiah, the appearance of this work is most opportune. No German critic of the Old Testament surpasses Professor König in scholarship, none has sought with more success to tread the *via media* between the hypercriticism of which men are justly impatient, and that obstinate traditionalism which is a blind leader of the blind.

The work before us opens with a discussion of the Unity of Deutero-Isaiah. All Old Testament students will be interested in König's very full examination of the 'Servant of the Lord' passages, whose bearing upon the Unity of the book has been so eagerly canvassed of late. In particular we would commend to their attention the sections dealing with the alleged isolation of these passages from the context, and with the great question whether the Servant is to be understood in a collective or in an individual sense. A very elaborate treatment is accorded to the question of the Date of the book, under the two headings: (*a*) Are the Prophecies partially or (*b*) wholly post-exilic? In this connexion the arguments of Sellin are closely examined, and the thorny question of the 'former things' (*ri'shōnôth*) and 'latter things' (*hădāshôth*) is carefully handled. Much has been written of late about the Place of Composition of the book, whether Babylon or Jerusalem. Full cognizance is taken in the work before us of all the leading opinions, including those of Sellin, Laue, Ley, Bertholet, Kittel, Cheyne, etc. Special interest attaches to König's conclusions regarding the theory of Sellin that the Suffering Servant of Is 53 is Zerubbabel, and that of Bertholet that he is Eleazar of 2 Maccabees. After a chapter devoted to the Principal Ideas of the Exiles' Book of Consolation, the work closes with a critical review of the arguments of Gressmann and others on the post-exilic origin of Is 56–66.

In the course of our author's investigations into his special subject, he incidentally drops remarks which are of much value for the grammar and the linguistic usage of the Old Testament, besides throwing light on not a few passages outside Is 40–66. At the end of the volume a complete list is given of *all* the Scripture passages cited, an arrangement which will be much appreciated by the student of Scripture.

The views of one like Professor König upon the interesting questions he discusses deserve and are sure to receive the careful attention of scholars of every shade of critical opinion.

[1] *The Exiles' Book of Consolation, contained in Is* 40–66. A Critical and Exegetical Study. By Ed. König, M.A., D.D., Rostock. Translated from the German by Rev. J. A. Selbie, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899. Price 3s. 6d.

Thudichum on the 'Epistle to the Hebrews.'[2]

THIS work is the second of a series issued under the title of *Kirchliche Fälschungen*. The Apostles' and Athanasian Creeds were dealt with in the first of the series, and now Professor Thudichum sets himself to prove that the Epistle to the Hebrews 'from its first letter to its last is a forgery, dating at the earliest from the 4th or 5th century, and written by an adherent of the priestly party, probably a monk, whose object was to show that the pretensions then put forward by the bishops had from the first the Divine sanction.' With a view to this the forger set himself to establish the permanent validity for Christians of the Mosaic law, and in particular to prove the duty of paying tithes to the Christian priests. It was this reference to tithes in He 7 that put Thudichum upon the track of the forger.

We confess that we are a little doubtful whether our author is to be taken seriously or whether he has composed a *jeu d'esprit* after the manner of Whately's *Historic Doubts concerning Napoleon Buonaparte*. But probably Thudichum is in earnest, just as M. Vernes is with his wild theories and airy speculations about the Old Testament history.

It goes without saying that our author's view of the origin of Hebrews affects much of what has

[2] *Kirchliche Fälschungen*. II. Der Brief an die Hebräer. Von Professor F. Thudichum, Tübingen. Berlin: Schwetschke & Sohn, 1899. Price M.1.

hitherto passed for ancient literature. What is it to him that ℵ and A contain the Epistle in full, and B gives it up to the point where this MS. breaks off? These manuscripts are not so old as bunglers like Scrivener and Tischendorf, not to speak of Westcott and Hort and Nestle, have supposed, and, besides, antiquity decides nothing as to the value of a manuscript. (We congratulate Thudichum on sharing, doubtless unconsciously, the opinion of the late Dean Burgon. 'Extremes meet.') The *Didaché* and *Apost. Const.*, as well as the allusions to Hebrews in Eusebius are forgeries, etc. etc. The book closes with the modest charge to the Church authorities in Germany to see that the offending Epistle is in future expunged from all Bibles intended for use in preaching or in religious instruction. If Professor Thudichum is a real personage and his book seriously meant, we do not anticipate that he will found a new Tübingen school; if the other supposition is correct, the anonymous author must be congratulated on his effective burlesque of hypercritical methods.

Miscellaneous Works.

An interesting collection of biblical studies and discussions of theological and other burning questions has appeared under the title, *Leben und Wahrheit* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. Price M.3). The author, Dr. Lhotzksy, deals in a most interesting and practical fashion with such a variety of subjects as the biblical notions about eating, the boundaries between Theology and Science, the growth of the word (Ac 6^7), freedom and faith in the Evangelical Church, and their relation to religious indifference, and finally the question, What is truth? The book is eminently readable.

Professor Doumergue of Montauban has published a lecture entitled *Calvin le fondateur des libertés modernes*. This title he claims for the great Reformer, from the point of view alike of theology and political economy, and vigorously defends his system from the charges to which it is exposed in view of his doctrine of predestination. He will not hear of the view that Calvin was the founder of modern liberties, *in spite of* his Calvinism, no, he was this *because of* it. The whole treatment of the subject merits careful study.

To Professor Ménégoz we owe an important pamphlet, *Du rapport entre l'Histoire Sainte et la Foi religieuse* (Paris: Fischbacher, 1899). The thoughtful, earnest, and generally convincing remarks of the author give much value to this little work, whose appearance is at present very opportune. Ménégoz examines various references in the N.T. to O.T. narratives, and shows that these are never introduced for the purpose of demanding faith in themselves, but always for the purpose of awakening or nourishing faith. It is true, indeed, that this effect cannot be produced unless one believes in the truth of the narratives, but Ménégoz does not therefore conclude that their truth must be affirmed emphatically, but that a duty is laid upon us to examine conscientiously and decide what is true and what is not. He has some plain speaking in regard to the numerous class at the present day who disclaim belief in verbal inspiration and yet are the sworn foes of biblical criticism. As to himself, Ménégoz confesses that it was when in 1879 Wellhausen's *History of Israel* fell into his hands that he first found the clue to the interpretation of the historical books, and was able to admire the gradual way in which God in His Providence trained His ancient people. Professor Ménégoz appears to us to meet very successfully many of the objections offered from the traditional standpoint, and to prove not only the necessity of historical criticism but its complete consistency with the Christian faith.

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Kunze's 'Glaubensregel.'

Messrs. Dörffling & Franke, Leipzig, have just published an extensive work by Professor Kunze of Leipzig University, entitled *Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift, und Taufbekenntniss* (8vo, pp. 560, M.15). By an inquiry into the difficult conception of the rule of faith, which the author believes has led him to new results, Professor Kunze tries to show that the Apostles' Creed and the New Testament are not catholic and antiheretical but positive in their origin, that they bear a close relation to each other, and that they come to us together from the earliest age of the Church. He traces the variations of their form and dogmatic authority both in the primitive Church and in the

catholic Church, and concludes by showing from Luther how and in what sense the Reformation has accepted and vindicated the primitive rule of faith, and therewith the Apostles' Creed and the New Testament Canon. The fundamental positions of Harnack's *History of Dogma* are subjected to careful examination, and, with the help of Harnack's results, Professor Kunze endeavours to reach a new view of the development of dogma, and more especially to break the ban of Rome, which to some considerable extent still lies upon Protestant theology. The practical issue for the theology of to-day is that Luther's doctrine of Scripture must be revived in a purified form, free from all taint of Catholicism.

R. A. LENDRUM.

Kirkliston.

Cheyne's 'Jewish Religious Life.'

A GERMAN translation of Professor Cheyne's latest book, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, has been published by Ricker of Giessen. It contains a few modifications and additions.

The Temptation of Christ.

BY THE REV. ALFRED E. GARVIE, B.A., B.D., MONTROSE.

IV.

THE results of our third inquiry are that the three temptations relate to the nature of the Messianic kingdom, and we are now compelled to ask the source of these temptations, not their historical significance, but their psychological origin. If, as those hold who interpret the narrative literally, the temptations were suggested by an external, visible, personal tempter, then no further inquiry need be made; but it has already been shown that the literal interpretation is incredible. If, then, we are compelled to assume that the temptations presented themselves within the consciousness of Jesus, we must try and discover how they came there. But, before doing this, let us note that when these ideas and purposes regarding the kingdom of God first emerged in the consciousness of Jesus they cannot have at once appeared as evil suggestions. At first they might appear innocent and commendable even, and it was only by the vivid consciousness and vigorous conscience of Jesus that the disguise was gradually removed, and they stood exposed for rejection. In His account of His temptations Jesus gave His followers, in symbolic form, only the last stage of a moral process, the result of what was the gradual recognition and the decisive rejection of an evil suggestion, at first presenting itself as morally neutral. It must be remembered that every soul has a certain content, ideas, emotions, purposes, which are morally neutral, until made, when the necessary occasion arises, the material for moral decision. The appetite of hunger, for instance, is morally neutral until it is brought into comparison with the emotion of compassion for the needs of another. A man may innocently entertain plans, wishes, hopes, without moral praise or blame, until they are shown to be a furtherance of, or a hinderance to, his life-calling. Accordingly the sinlessness of Jesus is not called in question by admitting that there were in his mind thoughts and aims regarding the kingdom, which were afterwards proved to be inconsistent with, contradictory to, His vocation, and so, for Him, temptations to sin. Jesus had not lived in Nazareth in isolation. Doubtless, none would know His inner life; yet He lived among men; shared the piety and the patriotism of His countrymen; talked with them, surely, not only about their home cares and daily toil, but, when he met a thoughtful and earnest man, about the moral state and the political position of the nation; studied the Old Testament Scriptures; now and then heard a learned Rabbi from Jerusalem give the current interpretations of precepts and promises, and became familiar with the doctrines of the schools regarding the Messiah, and also the popular expectations. When Jesus went into the wilderness, He took with Him not only His lonely musings on truths learned in the

Scriptures, but also the common thoughts that He had heard from the lips of men. Here was material enough for temptation.

1. It is often taken for granted that the current popular Messianic expectations were the source of Jesus' temptations, and some hold even that Jesus was familiar with the development of the Messianic hope which had found expression in contemporary apocalyptic literature. Until more convincing evidence of Jesus' familiarity with this apocalyptic literature is produced, than is at present available, doubt may be entertained whether He, a poor working man in Nazareth, had access thereto; or, if He had, whether He allowed Himself to be much influenced thereby. So far as I can form a judgment upon the question, even His use of the title, Son of Man, can be explained without assuming any reference to the Book of Enoch. That the popular expectations were familiar to Him can be unhesitatingly conceded; that even at the beginning of His ministry He foresaw that these popular expectations must be reckoned with, and a definite attitude towards them assumed, must be assuredly maintained; but that these popular expectations formed the sole source of his temptations may with good reason, as I shall endeavour afterwards to show, be doubted.

The Messianic hope of the age may be very briefly sketched. As compared with the hope as it meets us in the prophets, the idea of the Messianic age had undergone the following changes:—It had been *universalized*; all the world was included. It had been *individualized*; each Israelite was represented as having a share in it. It had been *supernaturalized*; the miraculous aspects had been more and more emphasized. It had been *dogmatized*; the poetical language of the prophets was taken literally, harmonized, systematized, and where necessary supplemented. The prominent features of the doctrine of the Messianic age were these: After 'a last tribulation and perplexity' the Messiah was to appear, heralded by Elijah. An attack of the hostile powers was to result in their destruction. After the renovation of Jerusalem, and the gathering together of the dispersed, the kingdom of glory would be set up in Palestine, but extend beyond to other nations. Then, according to many exponents of the doctrine, there would follow a renovation of the world, and a general resurrection of the dead, preparatory to a last judgment, the issue of which for each man would be eternal salvation or eternal condemnation. (The details may be found in Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Times of Christ*, div. ii. vol. ii. p. 126 ff.) Of these features of the Messianic age, the three which present the greatest resemblance to the three temptations are the renovation of the earth, the destruction of the hostile powers after their attack on the Messiah, and the establishment of the kingdom of glory in Palestine. To the people the details of the doctrine might be unfamiliar, but it is certain that all hoped for earthly happiness, for deliverance from their bondage to Rome, and for a worldly kingdom under a Davidic king in Jerusalem. Was He to fulfil these hopes? This was a question that Jesus had to face.

2. Had these hopes presented themselves to Jesus simply as popular expectations, however vehement and urgent, they would not have had for Him at first sight that reasonableness and rightness which gave to the moral test He had to undergo its extreme severity. It must not be forgotten that the Messianic hope was not a work of the age, it was an inheritance from the past history of the people. The doctrine of the schools was a development of prophetic teaching; and the people believed that the fulfilment of their hopes was guaranteed to them by the faithfulness of God. As has already been shown, the hope of the prophets had undergone change; but not a change so thorough as to destroy its essential features, or to introduce altogether contradictory elements. Much had been exaggerated, much had been neglected, the temporal aspects of the hope had usurped the place of the ethical aspects. Yet not so great was the change, that the popular expectations appeared altogether without the sanction of the Holy Scriptures.

It is certain that Jesus was a constant and a careful student of the Holy Scriptures, acknowledged their value and their authority, appealed to them for illustration in argument, and as putting an end to all dispute. His method of interpreting the Scriptures shows a moral insight and a spiritual elevation that defy all comparison; but He did not put Himself in opposition to contemporary modes of exegesis. It was by religious intuitions, not critical principles, that He outstripped all His contemporaries. His perfection as an interpreter was surely not a sudden discovery, but a gradual acquirement. His moral and

spiritual development had been fostered and guided by His study of the Scriptures, and His advancement in wisdom and in virtue in turn made Him ever more capable of understanding the deepest truths of the Scriptures. It is the brightest glory of the Old Testament that therein this sinless, perfect personality found moral support and spiritual nourishment.

Whatever was found in the Scriptures came to Jesus with authority; and although as His consciousness of His filial relation to God and of His Messianic vocation gained content and certainty He took up a more independent attitude towards even the Old Testament Scriptures, yet we may be sure He did not, without earnest inquiry and serious struggle between the habit of obedience and the sense of independent authority, dismiss any idea that the Holy Scriptures offered to His acceptance. Now it is certain that the Old Testament in its promises regarding the future contains predictions which, taken literally, as they were in the time of Christ taken, Jesus did not attempt to fulfil, and could not consistently with His moral and spiritual ideal fulfil. The essential features of the Davidic kingship were altogether absent from His ministry. To harmonize prophecy and fulfilment in this case, it is needful to have recourse to allegorizing and spiritualizing; but that is only an artificial expedient to get rid of a difficulty which is removed only by a recognition of the progressive character of revelation, the permanent developing element being exhibited in a series of inadequate temporary forms. With this problem Jesus was not concerned speculatively, but practically, and He solved it by rejecting all the elements of the Messianic hope inconsistent with or contradictory to the moral and spiritual ideal, which rose out of the depths of His own perfect human-divine personality. In the story of the temptation in the wilderness we have instances of such a rejection, which must be looked at more closely.

The Messianic age is in the prophets depicted as a time of temporal prosperity, of natural fertility, and beauty. 'The wilderness shall be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest' (Isa. xxxii. 15). 'The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose' (xxxv. 1). In the Messianic age, Israel is to hold a place of peculiar privilege. It is to inherit the earth. 'Thou shalt break forth on the right hand and the left, and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles.' Jerusalem is to be the spiritual centre of the world. 'The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it.'—'Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem' (Isa. ii. 2, 3). Strangers shall attach themselves to Israel, that they may become sharers in its peculiar privileges. 'And the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob.' Israel is to be the mediator of blessing between God and man. 'The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising' (Isa. lxx. 3). In the Messianic age Israel will enjoy political supremacy: 'and the house of Israel shall possess the strangers in the land of the Lord for servants and handmaids; and they shall take them captive whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors' (Isa. xiv. 2). Other instances might be given to prove that temporal prosperity, exclusive religious privilege, and political supremacy were features in the Messianic hope of the prophets (a full treatment of this subject may be found in Schültz's *Old Testament Theology*, vol. ii. chap. xx.); and surely it is features such as these that are represented symbolically in turning stones into bread, casting oneself headlong from the pinnacle of the temple, and becoming lord of the world by bowing down to Satan. It was the elevation of His ideal above the noblest prophetic aspiration, the transcendence of His personality as the Word of God become flesh beyond all former bearers of revelation, that enabled Jesus to pronounce judgment on the expectations of prophets as defective and inferior; and consequently led Him to regard them as temptations to Himself to aim at lower than the highest that His own soul saw. But by how rugged and steep a path of inward struggle He reached the loneliness of His greatness the story of the temptation shows us in broken gleams.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS xxv. 34.

'And Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentils; and he did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way: so Esau despised his birthright' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'Pottage of lentils.'—The people of the East are exceedingly fond of pottage, which they call *kool*. It is something like gruel, and is made of various kinds of grain, which are first beaten in a mortar. The red pottage is made of *kurakan* and other grains, but it is not superior to the other. For such a contemptible mess, then, did Esau sell his birthright. When a man has sold his fields for an insignificant sum, the people say, 'The fellow has sold his land for pottage.' Does a father give his daughter in marriage to a low-caste man, it is observed, 'He has given her for pottage.' Does a person by some base means seek for some paltry employment, it is said, 'For one leaf' (namely, leaf-full) 'of pottage he will do nine days' work.' Has a learned man who has given instruction or advice to others, stooped to anything which was not expected from him, it is said, 'The learned one has fallen into the pottage pot.' Of a man in great poverty it is remarked, 'Alas! he cannot get pottage.' A beggar asks, 'Sir, will you give me a little pottage?'—ROBERTS.

THE lentil does not grow more than six or eight inches high, and is pulled like flax, not cut with the sickle. When green it resembles an incipient pea-vine, only the leaves are differently arranged, smaller and more delicate—somewhat like those of the mimosa or sensitive plant. —THOMSON.

'He did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way.'—These words graphically describe Esau's complete indifference to the spiritual privileges of which he had denuded himself. There is no regret, no sad feeling that he had prolonged his life at too high a cost. And if Jacob is cunning and mean in the advantage he took of his brother, still he valued these privileges, and in the sequel he had his reward and his punishment.—PAYNE SMITH.

'Esau despised his birthright.'—The privileges which the birthright legally confers: the double portion of the father's property; the higher authority in the family; the greater social influence; all these advantages, in this instance enhanced by spiritual blessings as their most precious accompaniment, could have no value for one who regarded his existence merely as the transitory play of an hour; and who was indifferent to the esteem of others, because he had not risen to understand the dignity of mankind. If we were to expect a historical allusion in this fact also, the probable supposition offers itself that indeed the Edomites, who were masters of the wide tracts from the Red Sea along the whole mountain of Seir, up to the very frontiers of Palestine, might, with a little exertion, have extended their dominion over the land of Canaan, that with a limited degree of ambition and self-control, they might have become a respected and mighty nation; but their thoughtless and ferocious habits kept them in the dreary solitudes, far from the chief scenes of history and civilization. —KALISCH.

THE birthright generally consists in the right to the larger portion of the inheritance, 48^{19} 49^{3}, Dt 21^{17}, but we do not see Jacob afterwards lay claim to anything of the kind. In this instance it is the claim to the blessing of Abraham in the sense of 28^{4}, and the princely and priestly prerogative involved in it, for which Jacob is concerned. 'Before the tabernacle was erected'—says the Mishna Sebachim 14^{4}—'the Bamoth (local sanctuaries) were permitted, and the Abodah (the priestly office) was with the firstborn; but after the erection of the tabernacle (the central sanctuary), the Bamoth were forbidden, and the Abodah was with the Cohanim.' In a word, the firstborn is the head of the patriarchal family, and the right of the firstborn includes the representative privileges derived from this exalted position. Esau's forfeiture of these privileges is, according to Ro 9, a work of free Divine election, but not without being at the same time, as this narrative shows, the result of Esau's voluntary self-degradation. As Ishmael had no claim to the blessing of the firstborn, because begotten *κατὰ σάρκα*, so does Esau, though not begotten *κατὰ σάρκα*, forfeit the blessing of the first-born, because minded *κατὰ σάρκα*.—DELITZSCH.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Selling our Birthright.

By the Rev. G. Hay Morgan, B.Sc.

The birthright meant a double share of his father's wealth, lordship over the rest of the family at his father's death, and the inheritance for his posterity of God's promise to Abraham that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. All these things Esau despised. It may be urged that he was dying of hunger, and that a man may do a wrong deed under compulsion and not be guilty. But if he shows no sorrow afterwards, and makes no attempt to rectify the evil, he becomes as guilty of the crime as though he had performed it of his own free will. Esau showed no repentance or regret. He did eat and drink, and rose up and went his way.

We have each a birthright.—It may be external property, mental powers, gifts of disposition, or religious training.

A man may despise his birthright.—A young man with a good home chafes under its restrictions and learns to value it too late. A man with one talent despises it because it is but a small one. Yet the steward in the parable was condemned, not because he had but one talent, but because he did not use it. We will use our birthright according to our estimation of it. If we despise it we may neglect or sell it. Men constantly sell their fair name and good conscience for money, their mental capacity for ease.

The neglected birthright degenerates.—Refuse to cultivate any power, and it will soon be beyond the possibility of cultivation. The man in the parable simply left his talent alone, and it was taken from him. Esau repented after thirty-seven years, but it was too late.

The greatest birthright of our race is the image of God within us. It may be hidden under the débris of sin, but it still lies there. What we want is something that will recall that image and make it live in us. Though buried beneath innumerable sordid desires, it sometimes troubles us by prompting a vague yearning after something higher. But when Christ stands before us, we recognize in Him the One we have sought, who corresponds to the divine image within us. If that image has been brought to the forefront of your consciousness by the sight of Christ, do not relegate it again to the lumber-room of your heart, lest you, like Esau, despise and sell your birthright.

II.

By the Rev. George Jackson, B.A.

There is much good in Esau's character. His frankness, generosity, and impetuosity would make him popular. He was 'a jolly good fellow,' and this side of his character is often favourably contrasted with that of his sleek, double-dealing brother. But he is the plaything of his passions, gratifying the present desire at all costs. He cannot understand self-control for the sake of future good. He must have his food when hungry though it costs him his birthright. We think him a fool, yet some of us do the same thing daily. Whenever a man lets go his hold on a higher good to snatch a lower, he repeats Esau's blunder. Young men are doing it in many ways. *In amusements.*—Pastime is good, and it is our duty to maintain our bodily health, but we have other and higher duties, and to make amusements the chief concern of our lives is to sell our birthright for a paltry mess of pottage. *In reading.*—If instead of cultivating the intellectual life we weaken our powers of thought on trifling literature, and, as Ruskin says, instead of holding converse with the kings and queens of literature, are content to gossip with the housemaid or stableboy. So also in choosing a profession without duly considering its dangers, or in business,—in stifling conscience in order to make money, men daily repeat Esau's folly. How shall we save ourselves from it?

(1) *Think.*—'Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By *taking heed thereto* according to Thy word.' Carlyle summed up the teaching of Goethe in this one pregnant word '*Gedenke, zu leben*,' 'think, to live,' 'think about living.'

(2) *Look at life whole.*—Estimate things at their true worth. The present seems large, the future small. A mountain a mile off does not shut out so much sky as an eight foot wall by your side. We are all tempted to forget higher spiritual good and snatch at the trifles which dangle before our eyes.

(3) *Consider the end.*—When tendency has hardened into fact, when causes have worked their way to effects, when seedtime has issued in harvest—then what? All may seem well to-day, for sin is an arch-deceiver, but '*at the last* it biteth like a serpent, it stingeth like an adder.' Make it your daily prayer, like Bishop Andrewes, that you may be wise and consider your latter end.

Illustrations.

Surprised into Sin.—Surprise would be utterly powerless unless the character were previously undermined. And so it is no excuse for a sinful act; it is scarcely in any degree a palliation. It is rather a revelation of secret depravity in a man, hidden successfully from his neighbours, ignored by, but not unknown to himself. After the flagrant deed is committed, others may be at a loss to account for it. It is unexplained to them by anything in his previous career. But to himself it is clear enough. To him it is not an isolated act, but one link in a long chain of evil. He has been aware all along that he was sinking into sin. He has thrust away the troublesome thought, but he has been aware of it. He has taken no measure, it may be, of the growth of his guilt. It has ripened into grievous sin unnoticed. In no other sense can it have been a surprise to him. For all

the while the seed was there, and had taken root, and the noxious plant was growing; and he knew it, and he hid it from others, and he would not confess it perhaps even to himself.—J. B. LIGHTFOOT.

Despising the Birthright.—We smile at the mediæval legends of men selling their souls to the devil, but morally they are true. There are thousands on the pavement of this wicked city, thousands in the offices and behind the counters, some even in the pulpit, who for one morsel of meat have sold their birthright. They have sold their best aspirations, their spiritual honesty, their intellectual freedom; they have pawned the heavenly raiment of the spirit, and cast away the wealth of noble feelings and divine desires, and have hardened themselves into a routine of avarice or empty pleasure, or cowardly time-serving. And for what?—W. J. DAWSON.

THE small Crustacean Peltogaster has a birthright equal to the finest of its class. It is born from the egg just as the crab or lobster are. It has all the organs of its body in full activity, but in an evil moment it settles on a crab, and from that moment every power of its body is doomed. It will no longer provide its living, hence its eyes are no longer needed. It will no longer swim, so its appendages can go. It has no further use for mouth or digestive organs, so these atrophy. The limbs degenerate into root-like processes, which it sends down into the body of the host to suck up nutriment. Every other part of the body not being utilized vanishes, and the animal becomes a 'simple sac.'—G. HAY MORGAN.

HE won; and yet I cannot see
That what he won was loss to me.
I am a Prince, an army mine;
A kingdom grows around my sword:
The Hivites flee before my face;
I have my pleasure in the chase,
Now hunting men, now hunting beasts.
Be Jacob numbered 'mong the priests
And prophets who receive divine
Communications from the Lord.
Let him and other dreamers be;
I live for what these eyes can see:
This happy Earth's enough for me.—

G. T. COSTER.

LUTHER was told of a nobleman who, above all things, occupied himself with amassing money, and was so buried in darkness that he gave no heed to the word of God, and even said to one who pleaded with him, 'The gospel pays no interest.' 'Have you no grains?' interposed Luther; then he told this fable: A lion making a great feast invited all the beasts, and with them some swine. When all manner of dainties were set before the guests, the swine asked, 'Have you no grains?' 'Even so,' continued Luther, 'even so it is in these days with carnal men; we preachers set before them the most dainty and costly dishes, such as everlasting salvation, the remission of sins, and God's grace; but they, like swine, turn up their snouts and ask for money. Offer a cow a nutmeg, and she will reject it for old hay.'—C. H. SPURGEON.

YES, I who now, with angry tears,
Am exiled back to brutish clod,
Have borne unquenched for fourscore years
A spark of the eternal God;
And to what end? How yield I back
The trust for such high uses given?
Heaven's light hath but revealed a track
Whereby to crawl away from heaven.

Men think it is an awful sight
To see a soul just set adrift
On that drear voyage, from whose night
The ominous shadows never lift;
But 'tis more awful to behold
A helpless infant newly born,
Whose little hands unconscious hold
The keys of darkness and of morn.

Mine held them once; I flung away
Those keys that might have open set
The golden sluices of the day,
But clutch the key of darkness yet.
I hear the reapers singing go
Into God's harvest; I that might
With them have chosen, here below
Grope shuddering at the gates of night.

O glorious Youth that once wast mine!
O high Ideal! all in vain
Ye enter at this ruined shrine,
Whence worship ne'er shall rise again;
The bat and owl inhabit here,
The snake nests in the altar-stone,
The sacred vessels moulder near,
The image of the God is gone.—LOWELL.

Sermons for Reference.

Bartholomew (C. C.), Sermons, chiefly Practical, 183.
Benson (E. W.), Boy-Life, 190.
Brooks (G.), Five Hundred Outlines of Sermons, 410.
Candlish (R. S.), Discourses in Genesis, i. 441.
Cox (S.), Hebrew Twins, 1.
Dods (M.), Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, 43.
Dryerre (J. M.), Sunday Talks with My Bairns, 79.
Keble (J.), Sermons for the Christian Year (Lent to Passion-tide), 104.
Kingsley (C.), Gospel of the Pentateuch, 89.
Laing (F. A.), Simple Bible Lessons for Little Children, 35.
Moorhouse (J.), Jacob, 3.
Morgan (G. H.), Modern Knights-Errant, 194.
Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, ii. 348.
Salmon (G.), Reign of Law, 152.
Wilberforce (S.), Oxford Lent Sermons, No. 5.

The Hittite Inscriptions.

SECOND ARTICLE.

By Professor Fritz Hommel, Ph.D., Munich.

In view of the notice I gave in last month's Expository Times (p. 424) of a fuller article on the above subject contributed by me to the *P.S.B.A.* (which, unfortunately, owing to the necessity of casting new type, will not appear before July), it would not have been out of place if Professor Jensen had delayed his reply to me till the publication of that article. In this way he might have saved many of his remarks. He was aware that such an article was forthcoming, but he has preferred to reply at once.

It would only weary my readers (who, besides, without seeing a facsimile of the disputed passages from the inscriptions, are not in a position to form an independent judgment, but will look at the subject through either Jensen's spectacles or mine), if I were to go into such detail as Jensen, and were to give by way of reply my argument as it will presently appear in the *P.S.B.A.* I waive entirely such a course of procedure, merely remarking that anyone who really desires to learn the true state of the case, should turn to my article when it appears, and he will be convinced that, stating the result in the way most favourable to Jensen, the whole question is still an open one. But Jensen's 'Reply' necessitates my correcting also in these pages a series of directly misleading assertions, in regard to which the judgment of the readers of The Expository Times cannot be a matter of indifference to me.

In the first place I am entitled to ask that matters shall not be introduced which have absolutely nothing to do with the position of the Hittite question. I had spoken of Jensen's false view about Aegeo-Armenians (=Lycians) and Aegeo-Zagrians alongside of Hatio-Armenians, as well as of his utterly impossible, as it seemed to me, analysis of Atargatis-Derketo, and then proceeded to remark that I could enumerate many other 'absurdities' of a like kind. Jensen interprets this to mean that I call all his results that are not acceptable to me 'absurdities,' and denies to me, on the ground of my book, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, the right to judge what is absurd and what not. But what connexion is there in the world between the deciphering of the Hittite inscriptions and my book, about which, by the way, Zimmern, the eminent and sober Assyriologist, who on other points is so readily cited by Jensen as an authority, passes, in spite of his Wellhausenian standpoint, a very different judgment from Jensen?[1] It is surely pure spite to introduce in this connexion the saying, 'He who sits in a glass house ought not to throw stones.' In 1892, in my articles on the Astronomy of the Ancient Chaldæans (in the periodical *Ausland*), I showed the baselessness of whole parts of Jensen's *Kosmologie*, yet it would be ridiculous if I were now to maintain that on that account the author of *Kosmologie der Babylonier* is incompetent to decipher the Hittite inscriptions. My objections to the correctness of a great many of Jensen's Hittite results are, as ought to be self evident, wholly uninfluenced by what he has written formerly on other subjects. But the reader will now at least see clearly how Jensen everywhere introduces the personal element and can discuss nothing purely objectively, *sine ira et studio*. Thus he constantly attributes the worst possible motives to his scientific opponents, and supposes, for instance, that the sign read by him as 'Cilicia,' but taken by me for a serpent and interpreted as ideogram for the god Tarku, was intentionally[2] reproduced by me incorrectly as

[1] Cf. the account of Zimmern's review of my book (his judgment is to the effect that in spite of what he considers the failure of my arguments against Wellhausen, the book contains a number of noteworthy new results) in The Expository Times, ix. 448 f. Jensen has not realized up till now the bearing of my discussion of the West Semitic in distinction from the genuine Babylonian method of forming names (cf. *ZA*, xiii. 345); how then could he judge objectively of my book?

[2] [Perhaps it ought to be mentioned that the sentence written by Professor Jensen on this point was added by him when returning his corrected proof, just in time for the press. He suggested that possibly the true explanation of the deviation from the correct symbol was that given above by Professor Hommel, and directed the sentence to be deleted if Professor Hommel had meanwhile taken exception to the form in which the sign had been printed in his article. As

𒌷 (see p. 369 of May number of EXPOSITORY TIMES), whereas in reality the sign in question has 'the same appearance on the left as on the right.' But in my MS. I gave distinctly 𒌷𒌷, for which the printer, having no type corresponding, substituted the above form, which Jensen rightly calls incorrect. But even still it is incomprehensible to me why this ideogram, whether it is to be read as 'Cilicia' or 'Tarku,' should not stand for an arched serpent, especially as in certain inscriptions (after photographs and also, as it seems, 'squeezes') the one end, while of the same height as the other, appears to be somewhat thicker than it, so that we should clearly have indicated on the one side the head and on the other the tail. And when Jensen seeks to ridicule my suggestion that δράκων is identical with *Tarku* (*Tarkond*, cf. δρακοντ-), he only shows his complete ignorance of the history of the Greek language, in which primitive Asia Minor (resp. Scythian) loan-words need constitute no anachronism; on the contrary, it would be positively strange if Greek showed no trace of such foreign elements. Besides, even in Homer, δράκων is a word with a strong mythological tinge, and for the metathesis (*Tarku*, δράκων) we may compare Τροκον side by side with Ταρκυν—in Cilician proper names.

Nothing is more difficult than a correct analysis of Asia Minor proper names, therefore in my former article (p. 368) I left the possibility open to break up Syennesis into *Zua-nza-s*,[1] instead of treating it as equivalent to Zuanna-s (from Zuarna-s?). The idea that I could be ignorant of names like *Tarku-nazi* is perfectly ludicrous; in my treatise, *Hethiter u. Skythen* (Prag, 1898), I compared not only Tarkhu-nazi with Syennesis, but also the Lycian Τενίνασος (in inscriptions *Tävenäzoi*), and again not only Νήσιος (p. 28), but also Μολα-νείσα and Νεισίων. But all these analogies go to prove first of all that Συέννεσις (whether the second *s* be an original ending or an enlarging suffix, or a radical part of a word νεσ [*nazi*]) is formed quite in the same way as dozens of Asia Minor *personal* names, and cannot have been a divine or kingly title. Compare also the name of the Cilician admiral of Xerxes, namely, Syennesis, son of Oromedon, (Herod. vii. 98), a circumstance which by itself makes Syennesis as a kingly title as unlikely as possible. The idea, again, that the Median *Zualza-s* is identical with *Syennesis*, notwithstanding Jensen's signs of exclamation (which in his vocabulary may stand for something like 'horribile dictu'), is not so completely out of the question, since in other instances also many Iranian and especially Median personal names have close points of contact with similar names from Asia Minor. If Jensen had studied my *Hethiter u. Skythen* carefully, he would not have found the above supposition so strange. In general it may be noted that the numerous parenthetical points of exclamation are an odious accompaniment of Jensen's style, which without this is far from an agreeable one. How does Jensen know, for instance, that *Kode* is a special '*Egyptian* (!) term' for N.W. Syria and the bordering Cilicia? That to the Egyptians it suggested their word *kote*, 'circle,' is manifestly to be explained solely as a case of *popular* etymology; in the Tell el-Amarna tablets the district in question, which in all probability included also Cilicia, is called *Kutiti* (No. 79, reverse 13, between Khatti and Mitanni, as, with the Egyptians, between Kheta and Karchemish); perhaps one should recall בִּתִּים and *Kataonia*. Here too, then, Jensen might have spared his sign of exclamation.

As to the king of the 'silver boss,' whose name is incorrectly read by Jensen as *Shilkuaššeme*, it is quite true that we find distinctly *Tar-ku-u-Mu-me* (resp. *Sil-ku-u-Mu-me*), but it is quite evident that this is to be read *Tarkudimme*. Jensen gives a melancholy evidence of his poverty as an Assyriologist when he writes: 'Now even Hommel perceives that before *me* there is no sign *DIM* but *MU*, yet in order to rescue Tarkondemos, he ascribes to it the phonetic value *dim*, which this sign has *nowhere* else.' Why, the very name of the sign *mu*, namely, *mu-ḫal-timmu*, shows that *mu* has also the values *ḫal* and *tim*; the word marked in the Great Syllabary (line 95) *u-dun* is written *u-mu* [read *u-dun*]; the value *lim*, 'year,' is a dialectic variant of *dim*; and, finally, the ideogram *mu*, when it signifies 'bread,' has the value *dim* (curtailed from *ḫadim*, *adim*), as is shown by *mu-ḫatimmu* (written *amelu*, 'man,' and *MU*) = 'baker.' With the exception of the last word, which was only quite recently explained by Zimmern, and the name *mu-ḫal-timmu*, which was first made known to us by

no such protest had been received, and as there was no opportunity of comparing Professor Hommel's MS., it was decided to let Professor Jensen's sentence stand.—EDITOR].

[1] My words were: 'or, *if one does not accept this*, the cuneiform Zuakas would be identical with Syennesis.'

Delitzsch, all this was already to be learned from my *Sumerische Lesestücke*. At most one could still read *Tarḳúlimme*, which, however, comes to the same thing (cf. *Tugdammu* and Λύγδαμις), the name being in that way, too, identical with *Tarkondemos*. Since, by the way, the sign *u* has also the value in Sumerian of *un*, a reading *Tar-ḳu-un-dim-me* would not be quite beyond the bounds of possibility.

That Professor Ramsay rightly defends Professor Sayce against Professor Jensen's 'extraordinary misrepresentations' will be clear from what follows. It is nothing less than scandalous, the way in which Jensen strives to minimize the great merits of Sayce in the matter of the analysis of the Hittite inscriptions. It is a fact that Sayce was the first to discover in the inscriptions the ideogram for 'king,' and even if it should turn out that the sign in question on the 'silver boss' is merely a synomyn of the ideogram for 'king' (and not the latter itself), this would not alter the fact stated. Another fact passed over in silence by Jensen in his latest publications, is this, that Sayce correctly recognized the sign for the nominative (whether this is a mere determinative, or, as I still follow Sayce in holding, the letter *š*).

Further, Sayce rightly deduced the sign for the syllable *mi* or *me*; whether the first or the second Babylonian sign *me* on the 'silver boss' (Tar-ḳu-un-dim-*me* sharru mât alu *me*-tan, or, as was formerly read, sharru mât Er-*me*-e) answers to the particular Hittite sign has not even yet been made out with certainty, for the Hittite signs might read either *Tarḳu-dim-me metan* + land + lord, or *Tarku-dim me-tan* + land + lord. But now these three discoveries of Professor Sayce formed the basis of all further progress in the analysis of the inscriptions; in particular the first two must be regarded as a kind of key, and with this key alone Professor Jensen himself worked at first. For instance, the x-y-z-x (Jensen's *Syennesis*, my *Desandas*) could be recognized as a title, and not as a place name or the like, solely because it is followed by the above sign for the nominative (Ivriz 1; Bor, l. 1; Bulgarmaden, l. 1). Nor, apart from Sayce's discoveries, could Jensen ever have reached the conclusion that the group at Bor, standing between the title x-y-z-š and the ideogram for 'king' must stand for 'name of land (or city) + king,' or that the group before 'king' in the inscriptions of Jerabis stands for *Kargmi* (Karchemish). When Jensen (p. 410 of his article last month) is completely silent about Sayce's discovery of the *nominative* (the question whether the particular sign is a real nominative *ending* or simply a *determinative* does not affect the importance of this discovery as a key to further results), an energetic protest must, in the interests of truth, be raised against such a procedure. In face of such a deliberate ignoring of facts, I can regard Jensen's expression of the desire 'that the true state of this important question may be learned in England as well as in Germany once for all' as only a bit of empty phrasing.

That a certain sign stands for 'queen' had already been recognized by Menant,[1] and seeing that at Fraktin it stands, along with other signs, to the right of a goddess, it did not need the exercise of any great acuteness to see in it a title of the great goddess.

If Jensen takes it as an indisputable fact that a variant of the well-known 'god' determinative discovered by Sayce is a 'land' determinative, why is it that this sign, in which Jensen thinks, however, that he recognizes the picture of a *city* (p. 406), is wanting precisely before the groups which precede the 'king' sign, and which Jensen interprets as 'Karchemish' and as 'Tarsus'? The fact, by the way, that the ideogram which Jensen (in consequence of his false interpretation of this determinative) rendered by 'Cilicia' is really the name of a *god*, is now raised above all doubt by a seal cylinder published in Ball's *Light from the East* (p. 36), about which I will speak within the next few months in the *P.S.B.A.* As regards Mr. Ward's seal cylinder, it is evident at once that a legend such as 'Of the brave x of Cilicia and Arzapi (?) y worshipper' is quite improbable and out of all analogy, nay altogether impossible and inconceivable. On the other hand, two divine names and perhaps, further, the name of the author of the seal (what the third line means is, with the present means at our disposal, not yet made out), are something quite natural, and supported by numerous analogies.

Why the Tarku-nazi suggested by me in Ordasu must be identical precisely with the Tarkhu-nazi of Milid known from the Assyrian inscriptions, I cannot see; the reference may, of course, be quite as well to an earlier king of this name. Moreover, since we can only conjecture the phonetic value of the sign that follows *Tarku*, the additional possi-

[1] *Memoires*, etc. Tome 34, ii. (Eléments du syllabaire Hétéen), Paris, 1895 (Première Lecture, Juill.–Sept. 1891).

bility of reading Tarku-*tusa* (cf. Girba-tusa of Ramses, and the Lycian Ova-*tisäh*, Οὐϊτασις) must be taken into account.

Herewith I take leave of this unpleasant subject. As soon as my paper appears in the *P.S.B.A.*, I trust that those who can form a judgment regarding it (I have in view especially Professor Sayce, and Mr. Rylands, Mr. Ward, and Mr. Ball) may give expression to such, and perhaps state their opinion, amongst others, to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Whether I have hit the mark with *Desandas* can be decided only when more materials are at our disposal. But it appears to me to be beyond all doubt that the serpent ideogram is a divine name, and the sign of the hand [1] the general term for 'god' (probably *ghirpa*), and that both are used (as the first element in the compound) to form numerous proper names. As to the rest, let Jensen go farther on his way without deviation and always 'gain deeper insight into the contents of the inscriptions,' I am certainly the last to grudge him this pleasure. But I must enter my protest against the notion that my explanations are for the most part based upon his 'decipherments.' In my article which has been since April last in the hands of the editor of the *P.S.B.A.*, I have conscientiously noted all the advances which Jensen, founding upon Sayce, has made in the *analysis* of the inscriptions.

[1] On the other hand, it still appears to me to be extremely doubtful whether the sign from Boghazköi, claimed by Jensen for a symbol of the great mother, really represents a clenched fist. I reached my explanation of the outstretched hand (*one* sign with many variants) in quite a different way.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

FROM the office in Edinburgh (40 Hanover Street) we have received *The Monthly Visitor* (illustrated) for the year 1898, edited by Mr. R. Henderson Smith. *The Monthly Visitor* makes progress. True as ever to the heart of the evangelical faith, it is more alive to the variety of men's minds, more sensitive to the variety of avenues that lead to man's need of the gospel, than it used to be. There are those still who having named the name of Christ scoff at tracts. These are tracts;—it is sheer ignorance that would allow a Christian to miss their interest and usefulness.

THE GOSPEL PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTION. By JOSEPH PALMER. (*Allenson.* Crown 8vo, pp. 395. 6s.)

'Fools rush in where angels fear to tread.' That is much too severe of course, and we hasten to take the edge off it. But it is not possible after all that has been done on the Synoptic Gospels that Mr. Palmer should be able to settle the unsettled problems with a single sentence of bold type. He has keys—a master key, and three special keys. And these keys open all the locked doors and disclose all the hidden treasures. There is no doubt that Mr. Palmer has hit upon a most seductive line of argument. Some day soon we should like to show the points of it. But there are things left out, and there are things that will not be explained in this way. Nevertheless, the book deserves to be read, and we can promise anyone who takes to the reading of it that in Mr. Palmer's hands the study of the Synoptic Problem will keep them wide awake.

A PRIMER OF FREE CHURCH HISTORY. By A. JOHNSON EVANS, M.A. (*Allenson.* Crown 8vo, pp. 144. 2s. 6d.)

'Free Church History' means the history of the Free Churches, as they are coming to be called in England; that is to say, the Churches that are not established by the State. The name may still sound sectarian, the book is not sectarian. Mr. Evans has been scrupulous to discover fact and write impartial history. The only offence that his book can give is by its brevity. We could take much more with profit and with pleasure. It is too short, indeed, for justice either to the subject or to the writer. But it is welcome and well done.

From the Cambridge University Press there has been issued a parallel edition of the Psalter containing the Prayer Book Version, the Authorized Version, and the Revised Version. It is beautifully printed, and gives the marginal readings of A.V. and R.V. If it had added the fine version which Dr. Driver published recently it would have been nearly perfect.

The first part of Mrs. Margoliouth's abridgment of the great *Thesaurus Syriacus*, entitled *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. viii. (October 1896) p. 19, and accepted as 'a piece of pure scholarship from a woman.' That there are some flaws in this scholarship, as there were already in the larger work, has been shown elsewhere. In the first column of the present part the month *Khaziran* is called the *tenth* Syrian month; the reader of the O.T. will be puzzled by this statement when he reads Est 8^9 'in the *third* month, that is in *Khaziran*.' To say that לולרא (Ac 18^3) is the Latin *lorarius*, would have been a better explanation than 'a maker of rough cloth for tents or horsecloths.' Nevertheless the book is most welcome, and when in future times the history of prayer comes to be written, the ejaculations in the present book at the beginning and end of each letter will deserve notice. Frequently the longing is expressed that the book or letter may reach a happy conclusion. It is to be completed in four parts. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 8s. 6d. net.)

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND DIARY OF SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* 8vo, pp. xi, 373. 7s. 6d.)

There is an irresistible fascination about this book. The life was eventful both outwardly and inwardly. There was something of a tragedy in it indeed, and the inward tragedy was far more terrible than the outward. But it is not that that gives the book its chief interest. The story of that is in truth the one blot and blunder in the book—we mean the story of the outward event, the dismissal that left so deep a scar. But there is a great man's mind laid bare without reserve, a great scholar's judgment on men and movements uttered without restraint. Certainly the judgments are not infallible. But they are capable, and they stir up thought, sometimes from most unwonted depths. To the student of theology the volume teems with suggestion, and to the student of exegesis no less. But after all it is the man that makes the book, and we did not know that Dr. Davidson was a man like this.

THE TRIAL OF JESUS CHRIST. By A. TAYLOR INNES. (*T. & T. Clark.* Crown 8vo, pp. 124. 2s. 6d.)

The Trial of Jesus Christ: a Legal Monograph—that is the full title of the book. By A. Taylor Innes, advocate—that is the name and title of the author. That is the kind of monograph we need on the Trial of Christ, and that is the kind of man to write it. How much there is that is wholly new; how much that is true and helpful! We do not study enough. We do not put questions enough. We are too content with the daily superficial reading. If Mr. Taylor Innes had done nothing more than show us the wealth of suggestion and information that lies in a single episode in our Redeemer's earthly life, he had done us a service indeed.

BIBLE-CLASS PRIMERS. OUR LORD'S ILLUSTRATIONS. By the Rev. ROBERT R. RESKER. (*T. & T. Clark.* Pp. 136. 6d.)

A delightful study of a delightful subject. Mr. Resker has hit upon what lay under all our eyes, and made a book out of it that is as pleasant to read as it will be easy to teach. He groups our Lord's illustrations, and then they illustrate one another. And one sees among other things what a wealth of teaching there lies in the illustrations alone.

THE POLYCHROME BIBLE. EDITED BY PAUL HAUPT. THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL. By C. H. TOY. (Pp. 208. 10s. 6d. net.) THE BOOK OF JOSHUA. By W. H. BENNETT. (Pp. 93. 6s. net.) (London: *James Clarke & Co.* 1899.)

Six volumes of the Polychrome Bible have now been published. We understand its purpose, we have learned its utility. First of all it appeals to the serious student of the Old Testament, not to the careless reader or the hungry preacher. Next it considers no prejudice and respects no dogmatism. Then it gives the very best that can be given of scholarship and of workmanship. Professor Toy and Professor Bennett are in thorough

sympathy with the general editor's aim. They are also thoroughly familiar with the books they have undertaken. The feature that is perhaps most remarkable of all, we mean the absence of all that is unnecessary, is as prominent here as in any of the volumes that went before. Problems that have been discussed in previous commentaries at length and with heat, are not even named. The things that scholarship has settled are left at rest. These volumes will always be scorned by the illiterate and cherished by the scholar.

THE HISTORY OF THE LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY. 1795–1895. By Richard Lovett, M.A. (*Frowde.* 8vo Two vols, pp. 832, 778, with Maps and Portraits.)

The history of the London Missionary Society is part of the history of Christianity, part of the history of the world. It deserved to be written; it deserved to be written fully. The two volumes take days and days of reading, but they are happy, fleeting days, for not a chapter is dull or spun out. It is an invigorating book. God has greater things for the London Missionary Society yet to do. Those things are great, but what we feel is that they are the firstfruits of a harvest. And besides that, one is uplifted to get in touch with so many great sympathetic, suffering, and victorious men and women. It is an irresistible apology for Christianity; an irresistible call to higher service.

The Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, has published (through the Clarendon Press, Oxford) a lecture on *The Oxyrynchus Logia*, which he delivered originally at Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1898. Coming latest it is the most useful account of the famous Fragment we have received. All previous literature is used, and Dr. Taylor has been able to add not a little to it, out of his own unique stores, especially his stores of Patristic and Talmudic learning. He has also brought the Apocryphal Gospels for the first time into full parallel with the *Logia* (pp. x, 105, 2s. 6d. net).

ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES. By R. W. Dale, LL.D. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* Crown 8vo, pp. 398. 6s.)

This considerable volume contains but seven addresses, for Dr. Dale's addresses were not measured by the ticking of the clock. The seven are chosen from a large number that lay in manuscript. They are certainly worth publishing, whatever others lie unpublished still. Their titles may be given: (1) Christ and the Controversies of Christendom; (2) The Holy Spirit in relation to the Ministry: (3) The Idea of the Church in relation to Modern Congregationalism; (4) and (5) Congregationalism; (6) Mr. Matthew Arnold and the Nonconformists; (7) The Doctrine of the Real Presence and of the Lord's Supper. Circumstances are such that the last may be read first. But we have most enjoyed the essay on the Holy Spirit. It is more than an essay, it is an inspiration. The Spirit has inspired the writer to write somewhat worthily of Himself.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF ST. PAUL. By S. A. Alexander, M.A. (*Longmans.* Crown 8vo, pp. 216. 4s. 6d.)

The sermons to which Mr. Alexander has given the title of *The Christianity of St. Paul* do not attempt to exhibit a complete system of Pauline theology or a complete system of any kind. They are practical rather than theological, and they are sermons. Yet the name is not so wide of the mark. For a large round of daily life, both personal and social, is covered by the sermons, and always it is the Christian life as St. Paul saw it and lived it.

THOUGHTS ON THE COLLECTS FOR THE TRINITY SEASON. By Ethel Romanes. (*Longmans.* 12mo, pp. 296. 3s. 6d.)

Mrs. Romanes, the author of *The Life and Letters of G. J. Romanes*, has written a little book of thoughts—tender, simple, evangelical thoughts—on the Collects for the Trinity season. They are not for criticism, they are for further meditation. They are stepping-stones to higher thought, bridges to a better life.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. By E. H. Askwith, M.A. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. xx, 153. 3s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Askwith has not written another commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. He has not even written an ordinary Introduction. He has fixed his mind on the destination and date of the Epistle, and given us a scholarly essay, in which he supports Professor Ramsay's South-Galatian arguments, and adds to their force considerably. In all study of the questions involved

this book must be read. An appendix deals with the great difficulty of the visit to Jerusalem referred to in the second chapter of Galatians.

The fourth volume of the 'Eversley' *Shakespeare* includes Pericles, Cymbeline, the Winter's Tale, and the Tempest (Macmillan, globe 8vo, 5s.). On the difficult question of the authenticity of 'Pericles,' Dr. Herford is at home and quite convincing. The Introductions are just sufficient always.

The fifth volume is to hand also. It contains the three parts of King Henry the Sixth, and King Richard the Third. In a preliminary Note Dr. Herford adopts Professor H. Littledale into co-partnership as a proof-reader and a writer of Notes that will henceforth be marked L. One of these notes occurs in *Richard III.* i. i. 67, where we are told that the name 'Woodville' should be pronounced Wood-de-ville, a trisyllable, 'perhaps with the punning pronunciation, *wood-devil, i.e.* mad devil.'

COMRADES. By E. C. Dawson. (*Melrose.* Crown 8vo, pp. 224. 2s. 6d.)

Mr. Dawson is a boys' preacher. He is practical and intelligible. He does not indulge them with tales of pirates, and he does not disgust them with mere moralities. There is something in them to appeal to, but it must be transformed and not merely played with. The boys to whom Mr. Dawson speaks are the bigger boys. They need the preaching most.

Mr. Melrose has published a wholesome book by Adeline Sergeant, called *The Common Lot* (crown 8vo, pp. 224, 3s. 6d.). The heroine set out to do some great thing, and found that she had left her work behind in the little opportunities of everyday life.

Mr. Melrose has also issued a handsome religious story by W. E. Cule, entitled *Sir Constant* (pp. 192, 3s. 6d.). It is of course written for young people, and its outward appearance is in keeping with its chivalric charm within.

In the multitude of Helps to helpless preachers note should be made of *Gospel Seed for Busy Sowers* by J. Ellis (Morgan & Scott). There is a great mass of matter in it, and it is surprisingly clever and sensible.

Mr. David Nutt has published a new edition of a well-known commentary on Ecclesiastes—the commentary of Thomas Tyler, M.A. (8vo, pp. 168, 6s. net). The book has been wholly rewritten. It contains an introduction, an exegetical analysis, and a translation with notes. In the introduction the most important section is that which searches the book for traces of the influence of Greek philosophy. Mr. Tyler correctly says that such a thought as the dependence of Ecclesiastes on the philosophy of the Greeks is no longer startling. It is, however, sufficiently new and debated still to be of distinct interest, and Mr. Tyler has given himself to the subject with learning and enthusiasm. The analysis, a most difficult part of the work, is extremely useful. It prepares the way for an appreciation of the translation, as the introduction has paved the way to the notes. It is now, in its third edition, the most reliable commentary on Ecclesiastes we possess.

A new and copyright volume, by Charles M. Sheldon, has been published by Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier (*The Miracle at Markham*, crown 8vo, pp. 255, 2s. 6d.). The question is one of reunion, and if it does not come to pass as we expect, it keeps us at a fine pitch of expectation all the journey through.

METHODS AND PROBLEMS OF SPIRITUAL HEALING. By H. W. Dresser. (*Putnams.* Crown 8vo, pp. 101. 2s. 6d.)

Mr. Dresser is not a believer in Faith-healing or Christian Science as ordinarily practised. He has studied these things long and intimately, but he does not believe in them. Yet he does not denounce them. There is right and there is sometimes much wrong. He believes that if these efforts were directed by more knowledge and less fanaticism they would work great good. And he writes this book to lead the way towards a true science of healing in the name of the Lord.

Messrs. Passmore & Alabaster have issued the third volume of *C. H. Spurgeon's Autobiography* (pp. 376). It carries the preacher's life through the long period of hard and successful service from 1856 to 1878. It will be dealt with fully very soon.

RAMBLES WITH NATURE STUDENTS. By Mrs. Brightwen, F.E.S. (*R.T.S.* Crown 8vo, pp. 223.)

Mrs. Brightwen is become the young naturalist's greatest favourite. Once the publishers issued her books in commonplace condition. Now they know her worth and publish in beautiful style, with fine paper and profuse illustration, and yet at quite a cheap rate. These 'Rambles' are according to the month of the year. Let the boy or girl use this book month by month. It will be a great delight and a grand education.

GOD FIRST. (*R.T.S.* Crown 8vo, pp. 320.)

The title 'God First' has been given, not inappropriately, to the letters and diaries of Miss Hester Needham of Sumatra. There are missionaries who cannot write. She was a most devoted missionary, and had a fine sense of humour, which also helped to sustain her, and she could write. It is a story of heroic endeavour, told in the most modest and touching way. One of the best small books of mission work we have had of late, and of late we have had many.

UNSEAL THE BOOK. By Mrs. Ashley Carus-Wilson. (*R.T.S.* Crown 8vo, pp. 160.)

Mrs. Carus-Wilson is still best known by her maiden name, Mary L. G. Petrie. She is not a novice in Bible study or in recommending it. There is a fine freedom in her methods and recommendations, the result of distinguishing the matter from the spirit of Scripture. She is tongue-tied by no false notion of the infallibility of the Authorized Version; and yet her study draws us nearer to the Cross. We shall lose no time by reading this book, though it is often lost time to read books about the Bible and leave the Bible itself unread. And it is so saturated with clever modern examples of the mistakes that are made in misreading the Bible that the reading of it is a very great delight.

Mr. Elliot Stock has published the second edition of Mr. William Marshall's little book, *The Bible and the Prayer Book*. Its purpose is to prove that the Prayer Book is in accord with the Bible, but that Ritualists are in accord with neither.

Mr. Stoneman has published cheap unbound editions of the Rev. John Mitchell's *Points and Illustrations*, and of Mr. H. W. Fry's *The Brand of Hell*. We are not sure what the last is about; with the first most preachers are familiar.

It is already almost too late to notice *Oliver Cromwell*, by Horace G. Groser (S.S. Union, crown 8vo, pp. 140, 1s.). But it will outlast the celebration festivities. For, popular and slight as it is, there is accuracy of statement and Christ-likeness of spirit in it enough to make it live for a good many days to come.

Under the title of *I Promise*, Mr. Meyer has published a small volume of counsel to Christian Endeavourers (S.S. Union, pp. 76, 1s.). Their motive is trust in Christ. Mr. Meyer would keep the young people close to Him, and then all's well.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Thomas H. Weir, B.D. (*Williams & Norgate.* Crown 8vo, pp. xv, 149. 5s.)

We have to say that this book is not bound, but we have no other disparaging word to say about it. There is not finality of course, but there is in it a capable examination of the historical evidence available for the history of the O.T. text, a well-written history itself, and a good selection of illustrations that are carefully executed.

'The Temperance Problem and Social Reform.'[1]

It is not long since the *Spectator* felt constrained to write sadly about what it called the increase of callousness. At that time the temperance movement, like every other movement making for high ideals, was affected by the reactionary influences which were at work. Now, however, the tide has turned again, at least so far as interest in the matter is concerned, and probably there never was a time when the drink problem was so much in men's minds. This is largely due, no doubt, to the growing recognition of the fact, which is emphasized by the very title of this notable book,—a book which is at once a proof

[1] *The Temperance Problem and Social Reform.* By Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Crown 8vo, pp. xxi, 626. Price 6s.

of this deeper interest and a guarantee of its continuance,—that whether as cause or effect, or both, for in this connexion there is often a vicious circle of the worst kind, intemperance is bound up with every phase of the social question.

But other causes have also been at work. The later stages of the Royal Commission and its rival reports have impressed the community with a fresh sense of the difficulties of the situation, and have revealed anew the determination of the trade to prevent reform if they can. The Licensing Courts, too, are increasingly deepening the popular impatience with a system which is as arbitrary, as reckless, and as indifferent to the wishes of those most concerned as a licensing system could well be. The growing expenditure on strong drink is also alarming many who are not readily alarmed. They cannot but see that this terrible tax which the nation is imposing upon itself is far more serious than any foreign competition, or any protective tariffs or bounties. What is perhaps doing most meanwhile, however, to deepen the public interest in the temperance problem is the growing conviction that the liquor traffic has become a great menace to the liberties and well-being of the whole nation. Many who are neither fanatics nor alarmists say that it is to be a battle to the death between the commonwealth and the liquor traffic. Some even think that the battle is already over and lost. But surely the galling tyranny either in politics or trade of a traffic which for the most part flourishes on the fruits of degradation has only to be made known to be swept aside.

And it is being made known. Nothing more powerful or impressive on this theme has ever been written than the chapter in this volume entitled, 'The Social and Political Menace.' Never have the cruel shackles and the galling chains by which the drink interest has stealthily bound the constituencies been set forth in such a dispassionate light. Never have the innate corruption and the brutal selfishness of the whole system been revealed so impartially and effectively. It is hardly too much to hope that as this indictment reaches the more leisured classes, it will do for them what contact with the evil at first hand has already done for so many of the working classes. It can hardly fail to fill those who read it with a determination to destroy a power which is everywhere the untiring enemy of righteousness, freedom and prosperity.

This great chapter is only one of many important contributions to the discussion and settlement of the temperance problem which are to be found in this volume. The appendices alone give it a unique value, and when it is added that the spirit of the book is admirable throughout, and that its authors are manifestly keen and true temperance reformers, its outstanding importance will be apparent.

The discussion begins with a statement of the problem which centres round the fact that in spite of all that has been done, the *per capita* consumption of alcohol in the United Kingdom is greater now than it was in 1840. Startling as this fact is, it by no means proves that temperance reformers have hitherto been moving on wrong lines, and that a new departure such as is here advocated should be made. Alarming as it is that the *per capita* consumption of alcohol over the whole kingdom has gone up since 1840 from 3.89 gallons of proof spirit to 4.30 gallons, it ought not to be ignored that in Scotland the *per capita* consumption of spirits is now about a gallon less than it was in 1852. Now Scotland differs from the rest of the kingdom mainly in this, that during these years the policy of the temperance party has been more fully adopted. There has been earlier closing, and closing on the Lord's Day, and meagre as the improvement has been, it is quite sufficient to show that what is really required is greatly extended restriction along the present lines.

Then, further, it is necessary to bear in mind the vast social changes which have taken place during the period in question. Since 1840 the power of the people to spend, and especially to spend on extras and luxuries, has enormously increased. Not only so, but their willingness to spend money on anything which promises pleasure and comfort, has increased even more than the power to spend it. In addition, there has been the portentous growth of the great towns, which are now such an important factor in the situation. It is quite possible, therefore, that even although there has been an increased consumption of alcohol in the United Kingdom, there may have been decided relative progress in temperance. A reference to the state of affairs in France will show what is meant. The social changes which make for increased expenditure on self-indulgence have been at work there as here, with this differ-

ence, that there has been no counteracting temperance movement. The result is that since 1830 the *per capita* consumption of alcohol has increased fourfold, and France now stands far away at the top of the black list of European countries in respect of their consumption of absolute alcohol, while the United Kingdom only stands eighth. These are not reasons for being satisfied with things as they are. They are, however, considerations which must be present in any complete statement of the case, and which suggest that the movement on the present lines is not at all so hopeless as our authors suggest, and that we might reasonably hope for great progress if only the policy of restriction got a fair chance.

The main interest of the book necessarily gathers round the solution of the problem which it proposes. That solution consists of two parts: the restrictive and the constructive,—the first instalment of restriction being a statutory enactment that there shall not be more than one public-house to each 1000 of the population in any urban area, and not more than one to each 600 of the population in any rural area, a short time-notice being provided for by way of compensation. Thereafter, the scheme is permissive, each locality having the power to prohibit the traffic, to retain the system of private license, or to grant a monopoly of the entire retail traffic within its borders, either to its municipal council or to an authorized company. Our authors expect that the prohibition option would be chosen and successfully carried out in many rural and suburban districts, but they hold that in the present state of public opinion prohibition in the larger towns is to be regarded as impracticable, and for these they argue strongly in favour of public management.

Apart from the company proposals, this scheme is one of which all temperance reformers can heartily approve, and with regard to these proposals it must be admitted that every attempt has been made to remove features which might make for corruption. All the same, it is by the management element the scheme must stand or fall. It is claimed that 'if the proposals fall short of the full aim of the idealist, they in no way conflict with his ideal. They simply lay the foundations upon which he and others may build.' But what of the idealist who holds that public management in any form would intrench the traffic more firmly than ever and make it an integral part of our municipal organization, and that even under these carefully safeguarded proposals an appearance of beneficence would be thrown over the whole system which would make the realization of the ideal altogether hopeless? He may be right, or he may be wrong, but he cannot build on such a foundation as is here provided. Management is not only a necessary part of the scheme, it is a very prominent part of it, and the truth is that the one weakness of the book comes out when the sympathetic treatment of the company systems is compared with the inadequate treatment accorded to experiments in prohibition. Even if it is inevitable that in some form or another the drink traffic will go on indefinitely, it is one thing to continue to protest against it and quite another to enter into terms with it. At present it exists only on sufferance and in the face of constant opposition, but under management it would be recognized as an integral and necessary part of our social system. The true idealist is not able to set political gains over against moral losses, and strike a balance.

But even apart from the moral question, it can hardly be said that what is here adduced in favour of management is sufficient to warrant its adoption in this country. It is admitted, for example, that in Gothenberg, in spite of powers which it is very unlikely any company would ever be allowed to exercise here so long as there are public-houses at all, the number of arrests for drunkenness is not only greatly in excess of what we find here but is steadily increasing. In Norway, too, where the company system is said to have few of the dangers which attach to the Swedish plan, there has been an enormous increase in arrests for drunkenness. In Bergen during the ten years ending 1896 they increased 225 per cent., while the population only increased 33 per cent. No wonder that as soon as they had the power many of the Norwegian towns got rid of the companies and vetoed the traffic altogether.

The two great claims which are here made on behalf of management are that it deprives the traffic of its political influence and eliminates the element of private gain, but while both claims may be to a large extent admitted, it is probable that the benefit would be less than is expected. There would still be a large number of persons interested in the continuance of the traffic. Indeed, there is a sense in which the whole community would be

so interested, while so long as companies carry on businesses of any kind they will carry them on on business lines. At a meeting in connexion with the Hill of Beath experiment held last month to open a bowling-green and club-house provided from the profits, all that the chairman could say was, that 'after making full inquiry, he found that there was *no more* drinking at Hill of Beath to-day than there was before the opening of the public-house.' But so long as the drinking continues and men are what they are, degradation and sin will be the results, and public sanction may be an even greater danger than private greed.

In these discussions there is a great tendency to forget the affinity which apparently exists between fallen human nature and alcohol, and the corruption which has invariably gathered round the free use of strong drink. It might well be asked whether our municipal councils could stand this addition to their responsibilities. Those who know them best doubt it most. It might also be asked whose sons are to be set to sell the drink on behalf of the community and exposed to ruin thereby. The truth is that the proper conclusion from what is found in this volume is not that we should go in for management, but that the liquor traffic is unmanageable either by public or private means. It is so inherently corrupt and corrupting that it sets all conventions and compromises aside, and like some wild beast which has been chained up again and again it breaks out to degrade and destroy. Restriction, and restriction as nearly resembling prohibition as possible, is the true policy, and not management. If this appears an extreme or an impotent conclusion, the reasons for it are to be found in one chapter after another of this book. Even in Great Britain we are told of the police being so corrupted in connexion with this traffic that it is often impossible to get justice; of drink-sellers, who were just like their neighbours to begin with, resorting to the worst devices and even tampering with the children in order to sell as much drink as possible; and of the vast body of distillers and brewers, and even shareholders, becoming so perverted, that they oppose everything which would stay the flood of evil which is ever sweeping through our land, lest their gains should be interfered with. The truth is, that more than once the drink-seller is too exclusively blamed and the fatal power of the drink itself too much minimized. But in any case, our authors say that every system has failed except management, and they provide the facts which show that it also has lamentably failed.

Little can be said here about the constructive part of the scheme, except that it is not as important as its authors suppose. It is very unlikely that Parliament would agree to the proposals, and in any case, if large sums of money are to go into the public funds from the traffic in strong drink, they should go where they will be least appreciated—to reduce the National Debt, for example, and not to Peoples' Palaces and the like. That the constructive work is needed is beyond doubt, but it should begin deeper down, and it should be carried through otherwise than by the profits of an inherently vicious system.

There is a call to union, but it is to union on the old lines of local veto, the lines on which we have made progress already, and on which the rural populations of Scandinavia have become the most sober in Europe. If it is true that no scheme has any chance which does not carry the moderate men with it, it is equally true that no effective temperance measure can be carried which has not the hearty support of the rank and file of the temperance party.

This is a moral question above all else, and there is one element with which this volume does not deal, and that is the power of religion. The Church in our land should take advantage of the present interest in the question to rally all her forces to the fight, and, waiting hopefully on God, should face the evil as free from the spirit of compromise as from the spirit of fear. W. Muir.

Blairgowrie.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Oxford.

'The Witness of the Monuments.'[1]

I have no hesitation in saying that this is a book which ought to be in the hands, not only of every Oriental archæologist, but of every student of the Old Testament Scriptures as well. Nothing like it has ever been published in this country. The accurate and beautifully executed illustrations with which almost every page is filled, make it a veritable treasure-house of archæological lore. There are more than three hundred of them, the larger number being photographs, while the exactitude of the rest is guaranteed by the fact that they have been drawn by the practised hand of Mr. Rylands, the Secretary of the Society of Biblical Archæology. Most of them are published for the first time, and they all alike throw light on the history and records of ancient Israel. All the appliances of modern science have been used to make them as perfect as possible, though the volume in which they are contained is a marvel of cheapness. It is not so long ago since such a work, with its sumptuous print and paper, would have cost, not fifteen shillings, but fifteen pounds. No less than thirty of the plates are in colour.

The letterpress is equally illustrative of the religion, history, and civilization of the Old Testament. Mr. Ball is a good Semitic scholar, whose painstaking accuracy is well known, and who is beginning to be one of the veterans of Assyriology. He gives translations of all the inscriptions which bear upon the literature of the Old Testament, and it will be found that they are all thoroughly brought up to date. The references to parallel passages in the Bible, as well as the black type in which biblical names are printed, will be specially helpful to the reader. A chapter is added on the history and origin of the Semitic alphabet, with a comparative table of its earlier forms, together with the cuneiform and hieroglyphic characters from which it has been supposed to be derived; and at the end of the volume is a list of biblical proper names with their significations in either Hebrew or in some other Oriental language.

Mr. Ball generally preserves an impartial attitude on disputed points; indeed, as regards the Hittite monuments, his language may be described as overcautious. But it goes without saying that in some cases he assumes without question the soundness of theories of which he has been a leading advocate. Thus the connexion between the beginnings of Chinese writing and the primitive characters of Sumerian Babylonia is taken for granted, and though I fully agree with him in believing that the culture of the Pharaonic Egyptians came from Babylonia, I should doubt whether at present we are justified in saying more of the Babylonian origin of the Egyptian hieroglyphs than that it is possible.

Here and there, naturally, I should be inclined to differ from Mr. Ball's theories and conclusions. In a growing science like that of archæology, where so much of the evidence is still imperfect, this of course is inevitable. I should question, for instance, his ingenious derivation of the name of Shinar from the Sumerian *gi-shimmar* or 'palm-tree.' I have, indeed, long since given up the suggestion I made in 1870 that Shinar is a form of Sumer, though I see that it still holds its ground among the majority of Assyriologists. But it does not seem to have been observed that the name is applied to Babylonia by the king of Alasia in one of the Tel el-Amarna letters, where it is written Sankhar. Whether, therefore, we identify Alasia with Cœle-Syria, like Maspero, or with Cyprus, like W. Max Müller and Winckler (with whom I am disposed to agree), at anyrate the name was in use in Western Asia before the Mosaic age. It is not until we come to the eighth century before our era that we find it has been shifted to the oasis of Singara.

Nor, again, can I find any evidence that the Babylonian Narudu stands for Namrudu or Nimrod, much less that it was a title of Gilgames. And what does Mr. Ball mean by saying that 'from the fragmentary context' of the tablets discovered by Mr. Pinches, 'it is certain that the persons intended by these names (Chedor-laomer, Arioch, and Tidal) are not those mentioned in Gn 14'? There is nothing in the tablets in ques-

[1] *Light from the East; or, The Witness of the Monuments.* An Introduction to the Study of Biblical Archæology. By C. J. Ball. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1899.

tion to show anything of the kind. I have often wondered, by the way, why no one has started the theory that the tablets were written by a Jewish exile in Babylonia. The rebus-like fashion in which the names are written not only presupposes familiarity with them on the part of the writer, but also reminds us of the Jewish *atbash*, while there are curious similarities between the language of the tablets and passages in the Old Testament (notably Ps 120[5]).

I hope it will not be long before a second edition of Mr. Ball's book is called for. In preparation for this I would direct his attention to two points which require correction. On p. 53 the reader will be puzzled by finding the 'Abil-Ishtar' of the text miscalled 'Ilu-Ishtar' at the head of the section; and on p. 98 the pseudo-Sesostris, in the pass of Karabel, mentioned by Herodotus, is confounded with the image of Niobê on Mount Sipylus, which is referred to by Homer but not by Herodotus. I may also add that the suggestion that the biblical Nisroch might be the Assyrian Nusku was first made, not by Halévy, but by myself in the *Theological Review*, 1873, p. 27. But it is not one of the suggestions of which I am proud.

In conclusion, let me draw attention to two plates representing the ornamented centres of bronze dishes discovered at Nineveh. On the one, covered as it was intended to be with water, Mr. Rylands believes with great probability that we have a picture of the brood of Tiamât, on the other a representation of the firmament and the four regions of the earth.

The volume is appropriately dedicated to Professor Hommel, to whose untiring labours and keen penetration biblical archæology owes so much.

Recent Discoveries in Armenia.

THE explorations of Drs. Belck and Lehmann in Armenia have resulted in the discovery of many important monuments of the ancient kingdom of Ararat. A large number of fresh Vannic inscriptions has been found, and several of those which were already known have been re-examined and corrected. Among the most interesting is an inscription of Sarduris III., the son of Argistis, who was afterwards the antagonist of Tiglath-pileser III., in which mention is made of the Assyrian king, Assur-nirari, 'the son of A-da-di-ni-ra-ri.' The name, consequently, which it has been the fashion to read Ramman- (or Rimmon-) nirari, turns out to have been pronounced Hadad-nirari; and Hadad, rather than Ramman or Rimmon, must have been the ordinary pronunciation of the name of the air-god in Assyrian. Another equally interesting inscription is that of Rusas II. (a contemporary of Esar-haddon), which describes campaigns carried on against the Moschi (*Muskini* or Meshech) and Hittites (*Khatê*). Another inscription, found above the plain of Keshish-Göll, is believed by the discoverers to belong to the period when the old kingdom of Biainas or Van had passed away, and the Aryan Armenians of later history were beginning to occupy the country. At all events, no royal name is met with in it.

A considerable proportion of the new texts belong to Menuas, who seems to have been the most powerful and longest-lived of the Vannic kings. In one of them a war with the Assyrians is referred to. Another records the conquest of Barsuas on the shores of Lake Urumiyeh. Careful copies have also been taken of the inscription of Menuas on the stela of Kelishin, under Mount Rowandiz, in spite of Kurdish robbers and inclement weather, and the Assyrian text on the one side of the stone proves to be a continuation of the Vannic text on the other side. I have just received a post card from Dr. Belck, in which he tells me that he and Dr. Lehmann have at length succeeded in reaching the neighbouring pass of Sidikan, and finding there the monument the existence of which was known, though it was considered to be either illegible or inaccessible. After a fortnight of hard work the two explorers have made out the text, which is engraved on all four sides of the stone, partly in Vannic, partly in Assyrian. Only the upper part of it has been destroyed.

Excavations at Toprak-kaleh, near Van, have brought to light numerous small objects, including clay tablets, one of which, inscribed on both sides, appears to relate to political affairs. The inscriptions in all these cases are in the Vannic language and system of cuneiform writing. But the explorers have also been fortunate enough to discover a new Assyrian monument. This is an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I., engraved on a rock near Melasgert, and is a companion text to the one at the sources of the Tigris, in which the Assyrian monarch commemorates his conquests in the north.

Point and Illustration.

Salvation.

'I promise.'

SALVATION is a great word. It is conjugated in three tenses. There is the *past* tense, 'we were saved' at the moment when we first trusted Christ. Saved from the wrath of God; saved from the curse of a broken law; saved from the consequences of having been born from a sinful race, and having committed many grievous sins against God. This salvation is a distinct and definite matter, which is ours at the moment we exercise simple faith in Jesus. 'Being, therefore, justified by His blood, we shall be saved from the wrath of God through Him.' There is the *present* tense of salvation. 'To us who are being saved, Christ is the power of God.' 'The Lord added to the Church daily those that were being saved.' Such is the accurate rendering of 1 Co 1^{18} and Ac 2^{47}. We are being saved perpetually from the love and power of sin. The disinfectant of Christ's presence is ever warding off the germs of deadly temptation. The mighty arm of the Divine Keeper is always holding the door against the attempts of the adversary. The water is always flowing over the eye to remove the last grit or mote that may alight. 'We are being saved by His life.' There is the *future* tense. He will appear a second time without sin unto salvation. We are being kept by the power of God unto a salvation which waits to be revealed in all its majesty and fulness in the last time. Much as Jesus can do for His saints in this life, there is a point beyond which even His love and power cannot go, since they must bear about with them the body of their humiliation, which will finally, unless He come first, return to its dust. Salvation in all its completeness can therefore only be secured when at His coming, though we were dead, yet shall we live, and those that live and believe in Him shall never die.—F. B. MEYER.

'I cannot lie.'

Autobiography of Dr. S. Davidson.

WISLICENUS, once pastor of a church in Halle, was deposed from his office because of his prominence among the 'Lichtfreunde,' having undergone persecution at the hands of Guericke and the Saxon Consistorium, as well as the Prussian Government. The life of this worthy man was a troubled one. His free opinions made him obnoxious to the powers then in the ascendant; poverty came upon him and his large family; he emigrated to America, and found at last a congenial home at Zurich, where he ended his days in peace. A touching incident is related of him. His eldest son, six years old, seeing his father's face pale and sad, once asked him why he appeared melancholy. The father stooped, put his hand on the head of the boy, kissed him, and said, 'Ich kann nicht lügen.' Had he lied for God, his lot had been different. All honour to the memory of the man.—S. DAVIDSON.

The Hand of God.

God First.

I WAS so struck with the verse for 11th September on the almanac, 'The hand of God hath touched me,' Job 19^{21} and I could not help thinking that if Job had lived in Paul's days, he would a little have altered his expressions, and said, 'Ye need not pity me, O my friends, for the hand of *God* hath touched me!' for what in all the wide world can be more tender and strong, more skilful and loving, than the hand of *God*?—H. NEEDHAM.

A Public-House Sign.

Seed for Busy Sowers.

A LAD was passing a public-house the other day, and seeing a drunken man lying in the gutter in front of it, he opened the door of the public-house, and called out, 'Mister, your sign has fallen down,' The publican went outside, saw the sight, and started down the street to catch his faithful informer. Publicans could well label their victims with the inscription, 'Specimen of the work done inside.'—J. ELLIS.

How to Defend the Bible.

Unseal the Book.

'HOW are we to defend the Bible?' Spurgeon was once asked by one who had been vaguely troubled by cavil and criticism. With a wit and wisdom as well as a shrewd common sense that the profoundest scholar could not have outdone, the great preacher answered, 'How would you defend a lion? Surely by opening his cage and leaving him to defend himself.'—M. L. G. CARUS-WILSON.

A Lamp under a Bushel.

Unseal the Book.

A MAN, leaving college and looking forward to ordination, spoke for the first time on the subject of religion to one who had been his fellow-student during three years, and who was known to be an atheist. He looked astonished, and answered, 'I always thought you were an atheist like myself.' The Christian was horror-struck and abashed to realize that, while he had won popularity and reputation as an athlete during his college career, he had never shown his colours as a follower of Christ.—M. L. G. CARUS-WILSON.

And Endureth.

Unseal the Book.

A VERY large proportion of the Bibles in circulation are issued by the Oxford University Press, and printed on a remarkably thin, tough, and light India paper produced at their Wolvercote mills, according to a process whose secret is said to be known to three persons only. Its unique durability is due to the fact that its material is old ships' sails that have battled with storms and withstood adverse winds in all quarters of the globe. Even so, the words of life impressed on it have been proved by many generations of the sons of men, strong not only to do but to endure.—M. L. G. CARUS-WILSON.

Some Exegetical Studies.

By the Rev. James Wells, D.D., Glasgow.

Beholding.

The little web I am now to weave is to have exegesis for its woof and illustration for its warp. As the best of all pulpit illustrations are exegetical, I shall therefore choose only those words which are word-pictures, and shall try to reach the true and direct meaning of the Spirit in them. Ruskin very strongly recommends honest word-by-word study, which he regards as a chief secret of true culture. Someone has said that the history of a word may give us more knowledge than the history of a campaign. The exegetical preacher may adopt these sayings without hesitation or limitation.

We shall not linger over the ordinary New Testament words for 'beholding,' such as *ἰδεῖν*, *ὁρᾶν*, *βλέπειν*, and *κατανόειν*. These are mere words and not metaphors: they are not self-illuminating: their meaning is fixed only by convention or usage. But we have at least four words for 'beholding,' which amply repay earnest study. One of these is used only by Peter. In 1 P 2^{12} and 3^{2} we have *ἐποπτεύσαντες*: 'your good works which they behold,' and 'beholding your chaste behaviour.' In 2 P 1^{16} we read, 'we were eye-witnesses (*ἐπόπται*) of His majesty.' The fact that this word is used only by Peter, and used in both his First and Second Epistles, is an argument for identity of authorship. The word *ἐπόπτης* has a technical and very precise meaning. It denotes one who has been initiated into all the mysteries of the heathen religions; one in full communion, who has been admitted to the innermost secrets of his faith; one who enjoys the highest religious privileges and felicities. It thus admirably sets forth the unique vision and insight granted to the favoured three who beheld Christ's glory 'in the holy Mount' of Transfiguration (2 P 1^{18}).

What a vivid and suggestive simile this would be to Peter's readers! And what a complete renunciation of all priestly ideas! For the aim of Peter, as of all the sacred writers, is to share with all the faithful every spiritual vision which he enjoyed. It was death for the initiated to divulge the Elusinian and other mysteries. 'Off, ye profane,' was the spirit of paganism in its relation to the many. Priestism is a daring attempt to introduce these pagan ideas into the priestless religion of Jesus Christ. 'Mystery' is one of its watchwords. But in the New Testament 'mystery' means a truth not discoverable by human reason, but made known by Divine revelation: it is not a secret kept, but a secret told to the whole world. It is 'the mystery which hath been hid from ages . . . but now is made manifest to His saints' (Col 1^{26}). All the saints are among the initiated: they all are God's priests. This subject is admirably handled in the second essay in Archbishop Whately's *Essays on the Errors of Romanism*. Historians tell us that many of the most thoughtful heathens were attracted by the frankness, openness, simplicity, and universality of the gospel, which contrasted so favourably with the peeping, muttering, elusive mysteries of Greece and Rome. The conceptions of 'the mysteries' cherished by Romanists and Romanizers have far more affinity with paganism than with Judaism.

In 2 Co 3^{18} we find *κατοπτριζόμενοι*, 'beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord.' The Revised Version gives in the margin, 'beholding in a mirror.' That seems preferable to 'reflecting in a mirror.' *Κάτοπτρον* was the name for a mirror of polished metal. The museums contain many specimens of it.

Glory is excellence, conspicuous and resplendent: it is the outshining of moral and spiritual grandeur. All glory for us is concentrated in the Person and Life of Jesus Christ. In the Lives of the sages we find only splendid fragments and glittering exceptions. By Divine accommodation and adjustment, God teaches truth as we are able to hear it. I cannot gaze steadily on the sun at noon, but I can behold all its glory in the mirror of the unruffled lake. Often the lake is an idealizer, so that the sun or moon seems more beautiful than ever when reflected in its bosom. The gospels are a mirror that tells the

whole truth. Christ's glory revealed there becomes a 'kindly light' to lead us through the encircling gloom. 'Your God is everywhere, and yet dwells in your nation. I should like to see Him,' said the Emperor Trajan to Rabbi Joshua. 'Well, but suppose we first look at one of His ambassadors,' the Rabbi replied. He then took Cæsar into the open air and bade him look at the sun. 'I can't see: the light dazzles me,' said Trajan. 'You can't bear the light of one of His creatures?' the Rabbi said; 'how could you bear the light of the Creator; would not such a light annihilate thee?'

This beholding is not the privilege of the favoured few like Moses and the priests. 'We all, with unveiled face,' without the intervention of a priest. And we are, literally, being metamorphosed into the same image, from glory to glory. The present tense declares a process that is constantly going on. We become what we behold, we share what we see. The process is from the glory of Christ seen by us to the glory of Christ produced in us, and also from one degree of glory to a higher.

In his essay on 'Secret Societies,' De Quincey gives a gorgeous illustration of a reflected glory. 'From a mountain top I have sometimes seen,' he writes, 'a golden pillar of solar splendour which had escaped through rifts and rents in the clouds that to me were as invisible as the sun himself. So in the martyrdom of St. Stephen, Paul could see no gates of heaven that opened, could see no solar orb: to *him* was visible, as the scenery about St. Stephen, nothing but darkness of error and clouds. Yet, even as I far below in the lake, so he far below in the countenance of St. Stephen, saw, with consternation, reflected a golden sunlight, some radiance not earthly, coming through avenues not revealed to himself, some radiance from far-off mountains, such as, upon any theory yet opened to *him*, ought *not* to have been there.' This haunted him, perplexed him, compelled him to think intensely, and at last the reflected glory he beheld was imparted to himself.

The other two great words for 'beholding' are found in St. John's Gospel: 'We beheld (ἐθεασάμεθα) His glory' (chap. 1^{14}), and in Christ's prayer in chap. 17^{24}, 'that they may behold (θεωρῶσι) My glory.' These two words have the same root, and are both steeped in all the theatrical, spectacular, and athletic associations of ancient Greece and Rome. Θεᾶσθαι has to do chiefly with the theatre and amphitheatre—our word *theatre* comes from it; and θεωρεῖν is identified with the athletic games and other shows. The θεωρός was the official representation of the State at their athletic festivals, and so the verb meant to witness the games in the way fitted to make the greatest impression.

'Bread and games' was the ceaseless cry of the Roman people in John's day: bread for nothing and games for ever. The Greeks were theatre-mad: ἀεὶ παῖδες, everlastingly children, as one of them said: they turned everything to amusement. Shows were the chief events in their lives. The Greeks reckoned their time by the Olympiads, their great contests at Olympia. Hours before the entertainments began, tens of thousands crowded the Roman amphitheatres. They detached themselves from all other interests, and concentrated their attention for hours on end upon the glories presented to their gaze. The enthusiasm of each was heightened by the enthusiasm of all. The sea of faces was brightened with smiles, and the welkin rang with their rapturous applause. All sorts of wonders and sensations were provided for them, so that their interest never flagged. Perfumes, coins, lottery tickets, sweetmeats, and refreshments were now and again showered down upon them. Births and deaths were ordinary events at these gatherings, owing to the fierce excitement, the numbers present, and the many hours spent there. All John's readers had been eye-witnesses of these scenes; at least they could not help being perfectly familiar with all their details. What wonderful illustrations! 'We theatrized His glory,' we gazed delightedly and continually upon it as men gaze upon the scenes in the theatre and the amphitheatre: 'that they may behold My glory,' as the heathens around behold their pastimes, athletic contests, and foot and chariot races.

Bengel, in his own ingenious way, gives us a fine touch here. 'Verba affinia: ἐσκήνωσεν et ἐθεασάμεθα, uti *scena* et *theatrum*': He dwelt as in a scene or stage, and we beheld as in a theatre.

These three words—ἐποπτεύειν, θεᾶσθαι, and θεωρεῖν—give a wonderfully complete guide-book for the devout life. For they offer us as illustrations and inspirations, the most honoured and satisfying privileges and experiences in both the

religious and the secular life of the ancients. These three verbs were usually applied only to the most august persons and things. They all signify a beholding which yields surprise, wonder, admiration, love, and the deepest delight. Could we only carry into the highest region all that these words suggest, our devout life would approach as near to perfection as is possible on earth.

In another paper I hope to *postilize* upon this theme.

Contributions and Comments.

'My Words shall not pass away.'

As the tender melody
Dwells the core of every chord,
Perfect in simplicity
Were the sayings of our Lord.

Other speech is blent with earth,
There clear heaven was in each word,
Truth that found its mortal birth
In the sayings of our Lord.

Sage's pen and poet's lyre
Silent lie beneath earth's sward,
While the pure hope rings but higher
In the sayings of our Lord.

Other wisdoms, each to each,
Seem but Babel fresh outpoured,—
Wistful yet they backward reach
To the sayings of our Lord.

SARAH ROBERTSON MATHESON.

Isaiah lxv. 11.

Is 65^{11}, not Is 45^{12}, ought to be the heading of the contribution of Mr. C. H. W. Johns in the last number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 423, as well as on the cover). May I use this misprint as occasion for an appeal to all printers, publishers, and authors of Great and Greater Britain to do away, at least as much as possible, with the use of Roman figures, that source of so many misprints, and, in consequence, of loss of time. *Vita brevis.* Many theological books, I am glad to see, have already done so, to name but two, the *Hebrew Dictionary* of Brown-Driver-Briggs, and the *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by the very editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

P.S.—As to the question put forward by Mr. Johns I may refer to the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, October 1892, p. 733, where Mr. Davis quotes an Assyrian *manu*. The Arabic goddess *Manât* has been compared long ago, the god Μήν from Strabo and Jamblich already by Grotius.

Nebuchadrezzar and the Siege of Tyre.

IN last month's EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 430) Professor Sayce is good enough to refer me for information on the above subject to *The Records of the Past*, new series, iv. pp. 99–100 (1890). There we have the translation by Mr. Pinches of a contract tablet, from the dating of which we learn that in the fortieth year of Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon was king also of Tyre. But this does not supply what I desiderated, namely, proof that Tyre was *captured* at the end of the siege (573 B.C. according to Professor Sayce). The fortieth year of Nebuchadrezzar would be *c.* 565 B.C., and I never suggested any doubt that long before that time Tyre had somehow or other fallen into the hands of the Babylonian king or come to terms with him. We may then, I presume, take it for granted that there is really no *evidence* as to the issue of the thirteen years' siege.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Genesis iv. 7, iii. 16, and iv. 1.

Mr. Box's clever note on these passages leads me to give them a reconsideration. I do not think it is safe to correct the text of Gn 4^7 on the basis of Ⓒ; διέλῃς, I think with Schleusner, implies לְנַתֵּחַ, which is quite unsuitable. Mr. Ball's restoration, therefore, does not commend itself to me. But if, as we look at the groups of letters, we remember the habits of the scribes, we shall perhaps be able to make a probable conjecture. I will add that I agree with Dillmann that נָפְלוּ פָנֶיךָ gives a useful suggestion as to the sort of reading required. The letters שאת have, I think, been misarranged; read תִּשָּׂא and supply רֹאשֶׁךָ (Job 10^{15}). After שא it was comparatively easy for ראש to drop out. לפתח has originated in the same way as שאת; read תִּפְלְחוּ. חַטָּאת has lost the stroke of abbreviation; read חַטָּאתְךָ. Thus far we have reached this sense,—'Surely, if thou actest well, thou mayest lift up thy head; and if thou actest not well, thy sin will make it to droop.' The puzzling word רבץ has arisen partly through misarrangement, partly through corruption and omission of a letter; read perhaps בְּעֶצֶב. This may have been the beginning of a fresh clause in the Divine speech,—'in anguish . . .' We may suppose that it was the occurrence of the word בעצב both in 4^7 and in 3^{16} that produced the accidental substitution of the closing words of 3^{16} for the words which originally closed 4^7. I think Mr. Box's suggestion that the closing words of 3^{16} stood opposite to the close of 4^7 in the previous column a very ingenious and probable one. I suppose the meaning of the Divine speech to be that Cain has already committed a sin in intention, the consciousness of which may well depress him. In v.^{8} I think ויאמר must be wrong. Read probably וַיָּרֶב (אֶל follows, as in Jer 2^{29}, and elsewhere). Thus, 'Cain quarrelled with his brother Abel, and when they were in the open country . . . ; and Cain assaulted his brother Abel, and slew him.' I hope no one will be shocked at these suggestions. Scores of parallels suggest themselves to my mind. The versions are indispensable, but their help is often deceitful.

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

P.S.—In correcting the proof, it occurs to me that in cases like the present (correspondence of phraseology, where the phraseology is only suitable in one of the passages), there is generally a confusion of letters; simple repetition is rare. I would therefore read, for רבץ and the following words, וְאַתָּה חְשָׁמֶר־לְךָ מִדְּבָרִי עֶצֶב הַשְׁקִיט 'from irritating words abstain, and thou—take heed to thyself.' I may add a correction of את in Gen 4^1. Read perhaps לְעֻמַּת, 'even as.' Targ. Onk. reads מאת, *i.e.* עמת[ל].

Dr. W. H. Green of Princeton.

A Reply to Dr. Dunlop Moore.

I.

In the *Theol. Rundschau* of December 1898 I expressed my opinion of Green's work, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, as translated into German by O. Becher. My criticisms were reproduced in considerable detail by Mr. Selbie in The Expository Times of February 1899. And now in the June number of the last-named periodical Dr. Dunlop Moore takes me to task for injustice to Dr. Green, and at the same time expresses the expectation that I will publicly recall my strictures. Silence on my part would necessarily be interpreted to imply that I had nothing to say in self-defence and yet lacked the courage frankly to confess the wrong I had committed. Hence I may be permitted a word of reply on three points to which Moore calls special attention.

1. Moore holds that I am not justified in reproaching Green with superficiality and in adducing as the proof of this the circumstance that he explains the well-known interchange of the Divine names in the Pentateuch as due to a difference of meaning between *Jahweh* and *Elohim*. I had cited some instances in which such an explanation gives no real satisfaction. Moore, however, has sought to carry the explanation through, even in these cases. I must decline to go into this matter in detail, simply noting briefly that at the beginning of my review (*Theol. Rundschau*, p. 630) I wrote: 'Every reader *who is not prepared to acquiesce in merely specious reasons but conscientiously tests the arguments*, will recognize that the authors [I was speaking of Green and Hoedemaker] go to work in a very superficial manner.' I am quite well aware that I cannot expect every reader to approve

of my verdict. On this point, moreover, the possibility of coming to an understanding is quite excluded. One who rejects criticism as a very principle will find a way satisfactory to himself over every difficulty; one, on the other hand, who in principle accepts the critical position, needs no guidance from me in order to discover the inadequacy of Moore's explanations. But if one desires to find a clear statement of the question of principles, I would simply refer him to the admirable work of W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*.

Moore, indeed, charges me with stating incorrectly Green's explanation of the meaning of the Divine names, when I make him say: '*Jahweh* is employed when God comes into view as the God of salvation, as One who lovingly condescends; *Elohim* is used when He appears as Creator or Judge of the world.' Be it noted that I had to express myself with all possible brevity, as I expressly said at the beginning of my review, 'Space is not available for giving a detailed account of these works.' It is self-evident that I could not go into the finer *nuances* of Green's explanation, but had to content myself with a somewhat summary recapitulation. The latter, however, is not so unwarranted as Moore would make it appear, for it is simply a free reproduction of a short summary which Green himself gives of his view, and whose exact terms (p. 145 of the German translation) are: 'Je nachdem der Verfasser nun von dem Schöpfergott oder von dem Erlösergott redet, braucht er den einen oder den andern Gottesnamen' ['According as the author speaks of the God of Creation or of the God of Redemption, he uses the one or the other Divine name'].

2. I said, further: 'It is a caricature (*Zerrbild*) of criticism that Green draws when he asserts (p. 134ff. *passim*) that the critics, whenever the name *Jahweh* occurs in an "Elohistic" passage, assume that a redactor has either introduced a sentence from a parallel narrative or altered the original *Elohim*, and when he makes this allegation, be it noted, in connexion with Elohistic passages subsequent to Ex 3; for every critic knows that E tells us in Ex $3^{13ff.}$ of the revelation of the new Divine name *Jahweh* to Moses, and that from this point onwards he uses this name even predominatingly.' Moore quotes some passages against me from Wellhausen and Dillmann, and anticipates that I will publicly acknowledge my mistake, since his citations establish with such perfect clearness Green's assertions. In point of fact the right does appear here to be completely upon the side of Green; yet it only *appears* to be so, as I can show in what of necessity must be a somewhat lengthy explanation. But, in the first place, I see myself compelled to correct a slip which unfortunately has found its way into the proposition formulated by me in the words quoted above, but which does not materially affect the main point at issue. Instead of 'even predominatingly' (*sogar vorwiegend*) I ought to have said 'as well' (*auch*), for every critic would not subscribe to the first of these expressions. But now to the controverted point. I will first of all assume that Moore is right in viewing the statements he quotes against me from Dillmann and Wellhausen as witnessing in favour of Green. Even then I would adhere to my charge that Green draws a caricature of criticism, for the fact would remain that only some of the critics explain the *Jahweh* in the way Green alleges, while others explain it on the ground that E relates in Ex 3 the revelation of the new name, and that from this point onwards he has no motive for avoiding the name *Jahweh*. From the literature which at the moment is within my reach, I draw the following citations:—

Franz Delitzsch, in his *New Commentary on Genesis* (vol. i. p. 27 of Eng. tr.), says: 'With chap. xx. . . . a third narrator makes his appearance, who, like Q (=P), calls God אלהים *down to the Mosaic turn of the history*.'—Riehm (*Einleit. in das A.T.* ed. Brandt, p. 303): 'It (*i.e.* the source E) may be recognized by its using, like the *Grundschrift* (=P), *for the pre-Mosaic period* the Divine name Elohim'; and again (p. 306): 'At the same time we see from this passage (Ex $13^{17ff.}$) that the Elohistic *Ergänzungsschrift*, in distinction from the *Grundschrift*, still retains the Divine name Elohim even in the Mosaic period, *at least previous to the revelation of God at Sinai*.'—Reuss (*Das A.T. übersetzt*, etc., iii. p. 134): 'From the sixth chapter of Exodus, where Jahweh makes Himself known to Moses under this name as the God of Israel, onwards, *all the different authors of the Pentateuch* employ this name.'—Stade (*Gesch. d. Volk. Isr.* i. p. 59): 'It is a theological assumption that the fathers prior to Moses were unacquainted with the name *Jahweh* and worshipped God as *Elohim*; for which reason he (E) also avoids the name Jahweh *before the narrative of God's revelation to Moses in Ex* 3^{14}.'—Kittel (*History of the Hebrews*, i. p. 70 [Eng. tr.]): 'The other (*i.e.* E), in relating the earliest history down to the time of Moses, employs throughout the designation Elohim for God, and *not seldom* adheres to this even after the revelation of the name Jahweh.'—Finally, I quote from one who shares Green's sentiments a passage which

shows the view he takes of the attitude of criticism to the question before us. Hoedemaker (*Der Mosaische Ursprung der Gesetze in Ex, Lv, Nu*, p. 142, n. 2) says: 'The Elohist, according to the assumption of the critics, does not employ the name Jahweh *until after Ex* $3^{13.14}$, when, as he says, it was first revealed.'

The above are only isolated illustrations, but they show that Green has given a very *one-sided* representation of the critical position, and abundantly justify my assertion that he has drawn a caricature of criticism.

But I go farther, and maintain that the passages quoted by Moore, do not, when rightly understood, express what he makes them express. I cannot but fear, indeed, that the reader who is not familiar with the whole subject matter, will at first suspect that I mean to try by a sophism of the worst kind to extricate myself from the snare. In order to show that the following study of the meaning of Dillmann and Wellhausen was not devised by me merely *ad hoc*, I may be permitted first of all to call attention to the way in which their views have been understood by others, who will be free from the suspicion of hair-splitting dialectic.

Holzinger (*Einleit. in d. A.T.* p. 482) says: 'Not only has the Divine name יהוה, owing to redaction, found its way occasionally into the text of E prior to Ex 3 . . . but we may suppose, with Wellhausen (*Comp.* p. 72), that subsequently to Ex 3 it is "rather due to the redactor" that אלהים has, although not completely, disappeared from the text of E.' One sees clearly that it is Holzinger's intention to support Wellhausen's view. How does he do it? Let us read what he says on p. 196: 'Here it is sufficient to refer to the circumstance which is universally known and admitted on all hands, that this source (E) has studiously excluded the name Jahweh from the patriarchal history, and employs it only from the time of Moses downwards.' I ask the reader to compare my language about what every critic knows with what Holzinger represents as a circumstance admitted on all hands. To Holzinger, then, Wellhausen's view does not appear to contradict the assertion which he and I both make. Or, has he forgotten on p. 482 what he previously said? Not at all, for actually in the sentence on p. 482 there is a backward reference to p. 181 of his book, where he says: 'The avoiding of יהוה in the preceding narratives is shared by this source (E) with P, but E distinguishes itself from P by the circumstance that afterwards as well, alongside of יהוה . . . it employs . . . אלהים quite readily.'—I appeal to another writer, whose verdict is perhaps still more weighty, W. Robertson Smith, who, in his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*,[2] p. 424, says: 'In the middle books the criterion of origin derived from the Divine names generally fails us; whether it be that the Elohist took no pains to avoid the use of the name Jahweh after he had recorded the revelation made in that name to Moses at the Bush (Ex 3), or whether, as some suppose, the original prevalence of Elohim in his narrative has disappeared at some stage of the subsequent redaction.' Observe he does not say 'the originally *exclusive use* of the name Elohim,' but 'the original *prevalence*.' So that he, too, although certainly well acquainted with the view cited by Moore, does not interpret it to mean that in the opinion of the critics *every* יהוה in Elohistic texts is due to the redactor. I trust I shall not now be suspected of giving a sophistical and *ad hoc* devised explanation of the words of Wellhausen and Dillmann when I say that Moore is wrong in appealing to them. In the sentence quoted from Wellhausen (*Comp.* p. 72) I have to ask the reader to note carefully the words which I now italicise: 'We actually find אלהים here (Ex 3) everywhere in the mouth of the narrator, vv.$^{11.12.13.14.15}$, whereas from now onwards this criterion fails us for a considerable time, a circumstance, indeed, due apparently *rather* to the redactor than to the intention of the Elohist himself, who after this passage as well as before it seems to have *for the most part* ('für gewöhnlich') employed the general name.' The expression 'for the most part' is not the same as 'always,' and the word 'rather,' while it certainly implies that the redactor had more to do with the presence of the name יהוה than the author himself, yet implies that the latter must bear a part of the responsibility. And in point of fact Wellhausen points out on the same page, in a footnote, that in v.^{14} E must have written יהוה (instead of אהיה).

I come now to the quotation from Dillmann. I do not deny that its terms are incapable of being interpreted otherwise than is done by Moore, and also, *e.g.*, by Kittel in his *History of the Hebrews*, i. p. 70, n. 1. But I maintain against Moore and Kittel that Dillmann in the sentence in question has not given *adequate* expression to his view. In order

that the reader here also may judge for himself, I must submit the materials to his inspection somewhat more completely, for I am well aware that so bold an allegation as I have just made must in the first instance awaken mistrust in the mind of the reader. Dillmann, in his *Comm. on Ex* 3 (p. 23), says: 'Certainly the יהוה of vv.[2. 4. 7] (in vv.[15. 16. 18] the use of יהוה is nothing surprising) shows . . . that here too R has altered something, in conformity with C (=J).' That is to say, he takes exception to the occurrence of יהוה in certain passages ascribed by him (falsely, indeed, I believe) to E, but only prior to Ex $3^{13ff.}$. On the other hand, in the verses that follow Ex 3^{14} he does not find it necessary to assume the interposition of R, that is to say, he holds that E himself here wrote יהוה. On Ex 3^{18} he even remarks expressly that יהוה here is wanting in the LXX. It would have been very natural for him to pronounce יהוה in this instance an addition to the text, especially as one can readily leave it out. But he goes on to say that the genuineness of the יהוה 'is confirmed by 5^{1}.' There are, indeed, passages subsequent to Ex 3^{14} in which Dillmann holds that R has substituted יהוה for an original אלהים, namely, Ex $19^{3ff.}$, Nu 10^{33} 22 f. and certain others. I will return to this presently. Meanwhile, I am content to establish the fact that Dillmann, in his *Commentary on Exodus*, asserts that E himself after Ex 3^{14} sometimes wrote יהוה, and that he thus contradicts the sentence quoted from p. 617 of the closing dissertation in his *Commentary on the Hexateuch*. Now I am quite aware that, in his Preface to his *Commentary on Numbers, Deut., and Joshua*, Dillmann says that he desires anything in the *Commentary on Exodus and Leviticus* which is not in harmony with the closing dissertation on the 'Composition of the Hexateuch' to be corrected in accordance with the latter. I do not think, however, that this has any bearing upon the present question. I appeal first of all to the judgment of another, in order not to incur the suspicion of doing violence to Dillmann for the sake of keeping myself in the right. Dillmann's wish has been very conscientiously carried out in the new edition of the *Ex.-Lev.* commentary by Ryssel, who, however, has not seen it necessary to alter the above remarks on Ex 3, and I consider that he has acted quite rightly in not taking Dillmann's wish to extend to these. For Dillmann, when he has occasion once more in his 'Composition of the Hexateuch' to speak of the alteration of the Divine name by R, says (p. 682) that we must set down to the account of R 'die Aenderung des Gottesnames Ex $3^{2. 4. 7}$ $19^{3ff.}$, Nu 22 f. u. ö.' Observe he does not say 'the alteration of the Divine name in every passage where יהוה now stands in Elohistic sections,' but he names certain specific instances, and indeed precisely those where in his commentary on Ex and Nu he had already assumed an alteration (the 'und öfter' refers to cases like that of Nu 10^{33}), and no others. In his 'Composition' (p. 682) he thus maintains exactly the same position as in his *Ex.-Lev.* commentary! Hence I cannot but conclude that the sentence quoted from p. 617 of the 'Composition' does not adequately express Dillmann's view; it would run more correctly thus: 'sie (die Benennung Gottes mit Elohim) ist bei ihm (E) durchgängig, und יהוה in seinen Stücken *oft* erst durch die späteren Bearbeiter hereingebracht, *obwohl E selbst nach Ex* 3^{14} יהוה *nicht ganz vermieden hat.*' But, it may be asked, Does he not say 'sie ist bei ihm *durchgängig*'? Certainly, but in the light of the above citations this can only mean that E follows a different course from P, who employs אלהים only *before* the time of Moses, whereas in E אלהים is found at a later period as well, that is to say, it runs through both parts of his work, although it is not implied that the name occurs with equal consistency in both. But now I shall be asked again, Are you not imposing upon the word 'durchgängig' a sense which no one else connects with it? By no means. I find the same term employed in the same connexion also by Cornill (*Einleit.* ed. 3 and 4, p. 41) and by Kautzsch (*Abriss d. Gesch. d. A.T. Schrifttums* [Sonderabdruck, 1897], p. 37). Neither of these scholars has ever asserted that every occurrence of יהוה in Elohistic texts is due to R. I presume, therefore, that they have used the word 'durchgängig' in the sense adopted by me. Professor Kautzsch, in reply to an inquiry I addressed to him, authorizes me to state here publicly that my interpretation answers exactly to his intention. There still remains, however, an objection which might be urged against me, and which I must meet by anticipation. If the critics really take no offence at the use of יהוה by the Elohist, why do some of them maintain that R has frequently altered the Divine name? Is not this assertion of theirs purely arbitrary, and is it not explicable only upon the assumption that they really hold, as Green alleges, that E, even after Ex 3^{14}, consist-

ently employed אלהים? This brings me back to the passages cited by Dillmann ('Composition,' p. 682). If one consults Dillmann's commentary on these passages he will find the explanation: the assumption of an alteration of the Divine name by R is based upon the circumstance that in these passages the LXX and frequently also the Samaritan offer the readings ὁ Θεός and אלהים(ה) respectively, or (so in Nu 10^{33}) that E elsewhere in this particular collocation ('mountain of God' for Horeb) regularly uses אלהים. Thus it is for quite special reasons that the alteration of the name is assumed in a series of passages, and not in the interests of the theory that E never employed the name Jahweh, as Green asserts. Hence I reproached Green with having drawn a caricature of criticism, and the reader will perceive that I did that with full consciousness, and now see no occasion to withdraw my charge. I may be allowed, in passing, to mention that I have recently set forth my own views as to the occurrence of the Divine name in E after Ex 3^{14}, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1899, pp. 339 ff., where it will be found that I too regard an alteration of the name in some passages as probable. What I say there (p. 341) about Jos 24 (it was written as long ago as June 1898) I wish to see corrected in conformity with my commentary on Joshua, which will appear shortly.

Even if everything that I have said here in opposition to Moore could not be maintained, I should not feel myself compelled to withdraw my charge against Green, which rests not merely on this one point, but on his whole presentation of the critical position, which, with full consciousness of the bearing of my words, I call unjustified, and a caricature of the reality. As an illustration of this may be noted first and foremost the circumstance that Green *continually* attributes to the critics the worst motives in a fashion which I can call by no other name than perfidious. We find him using with extreme frequency such expressions as [I quote from the German translation] 'betrügerisches Raisonnement' (p. 162), 'listige Kniffe' (p. 166), 'Leichtfertigkeit der Methode' (p. 169), etc. This brings me, however, to the last point.

3. Moore characterizes it as 'unworthy of a serious critic' that I say, 'Green denies, of course, that a critic believes in Divine revelation, rather have they all from first to last wrought in the interest of unbelief.' I must, indeed, confess that I regret having written *so*, not, however, because I regard the terms as unjustified, but because unfortunately I omitted to indicate by quotation marks that *I was citing Green's own words*. They run thus (p. 225): 'It is noteworthy that the partition hypotheses in all their forms have from first to last been constructed in the interest of unbelief,' and (p. 236) 'It is well enough known that the whole succession of distinguished scholars who have worked out the partition hypothesis in its application to the Pentateuch believed in no direct supernatural revelation.' There are more statements of the same kind. If Green has expressed himself otherwise elsewhere, that makes no difference; in my review it was only of Green's *The Higher Criticism* that I had to take account.

I hope that the reader, whose pardon I must ask for having taxed his patience so long, will have reached the conviction that it was with the full consciousness of my responsibliity that I passed judgment upon Green, and that he will retain this conviction even if I should meet with silence any future rejoinder by Moore.

C. Steuernagel.

Halle.

II.

As Dr. Dunlop Moore evidently intends to include myself in the condemnation he passes upon Dr. Steuernagel, I may be allowed a single word in self-defence. It is needless to say that I associate myself fully with the positions put forward in the above reply, which its author sent to me. The only additional point I should like to call attention to, is the quotation Dr. Moore gives from my notes when he says, 'Dr. Green is censured further for maintaining that "Scripture is an organism whose parts are inspired by God, and consequently combine in a harmonious whole."' Why did he not quote the following words, without which the charge is unfairly stated, and which were the most essential, as distinguishing the position of the apologists from the critics?—'*But he refuses to view this harmony as the result of a process of development under Divine guidance; he will not have a human factor recognized at all, because the possibility of human error would thus be introduced.*' The quotation furnishes Dr. Moore with a text for discoursing on the view of inspiration held by Christ and His apostles, which Dr. Steuernagel and myself, it is insinuated, have sought to impugn. To use Dr. Moore's own language, 'this is a random fling unworthy of a serious critic.'

J. A. Selbie.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

LITTLE can be said yet, beyond what was said last month, about Professor Margoliouth's challenge. Short general reviews of the pamphlet have appeared in the *Guardian* and the *Record*, and Professor Margoliouth has replied to both. Mrs. Gibson has made a somewhat more definite answer in the *Record*, to which Professor Margoliouth has also replied. And having named Professor Driver pointedly in the *Guardian*, he has had the satisfaction of a preliminary letter from him. But all that is preparatory skirmishing, the battle is not begun.

Two things only are brought out. The one is that Professor Margoliouth was himself convinced of the genuineness of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus little more than two years ago. For in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for April 1897 he wrote an article on the famous leaves, and had no suspicion of their being a translation. So if he succeeds in condemning others he will have to admit that he was till recently in the same condemnation himself.

The other thing thus far brought out is that more leaves of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus—be it the original or not—have been discovered and will immediately be published. They cover some ten or twelve chapters. They are in the hands of Dr. Taylor and Dr. Schechter. And Mrs. Gibson at least expects that they will settle the whole matter.

In the *Expositor* for July, Professor Ramsay gives his judgment on the still unsettled question, What was St. Paul's thorn in the flesh? If his judgment is true, then there is at least one striking likeness between the earliest missionary labour and the latest.

There are two prominent facts regarding the thorn in the flesh. First, the disease was active during St. Paul's residence in Galatia, and yet he could take long journeys. That it was active is evident from his declaration that the Galatians—the Galatian churches in general apparently—saw it and did not despise the sufferer. That it was compatible with long journeys is a necessary belief on either theory of where 'Galatia' was; necessary if you hold with Professor Ramsay that it was South Galatia, more necessary if you believe it was North. Professor Ramsay concludes that it was not a single attack of illness. It was intermittent. Now the apostle was prostrate, now he could travel and preach.

Second, the apostle expected the Galatians to regard the disease with loathing or contempt. Instead of that, they received him as an angel of God. It is clear to Professor Ramsay that there

were these two alternatives: either he was specially under God's curse, or he was specially sustained by God's blessing. Now the inscriptions tell us that there was one disease that was regarded in Asia Minor as due to the immediate action of God. That disease was fever. If a native of that country prayed to the god or goddess to avenge him of his enemy, he prayed that he might be burnt up with fever. For in fever the strength wastes away and there is no visible cause of it. 'May he suffer fevers, chills, torments, pallors, sweatings, heats by day and by night.' That is the translation of a recently discovered inscription.

Professor Ramsay knows about the fevers of Asia Minor. He knows that they come in recurring attacks, and when they pass they leave the sufferer weak but fit to move to higher latitudes. He knows also that one of their most trying accompaniments is severe headache. It is just as the apostle describes it, like a hot bar thrust through the head, like a stake in the flesh.

And Professor Ramsay's judgment is in the line of tradition. The tradition in Asia Minor, which was current as early as the second century, was that the extreme physical pain which accompanied St. Paul's disease, and which he called the stake in the flesh, was severe headache. If we are to give any weight at all to tradition, says Lightfoot, we must give weight to this. Like the minute description of the apostle's face and figure, his headaches have come down by an unbroken tradition from the second century to our own.

In the same number of the *Expositor* Professor Cheyne goes a-hunting after 'husks,' and finds some in unexpected places. The husks which the swine did eat were, as we know, the pods of the carob tree. Well, Professor Cheyne finds them in 2 K 18^{27}, which he translates in this way: 'But the Rab-shakeh said . . . Has he not sent me to the men who sit on the wall, that they may eat their carobs (חֲרוּבֵיהֶם) and drink their sour wine with you?' The student of Hebrew will see at a glance the 'textual emendations' that furnish the translation.

He finds them also in Is $1^{19.20}$. The translation of the English versions is: 'If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.' The phrase 'ye shall be devoured with the sword' is not very easy to take out of the Hebrew. Some render 'ye shall be made to eat the sword.' And Duhm, altering a little, has simply, 'ye shall eat the sword.' But that is difficult both to understand and to do. So Professor Cheyne emends—

> 'If ye be willing and obedient, the best (fruits) of the land shall ye eat;
> But if ye refuse and rebel, carob pods shall ye eat (חֲרוּבִים תֹּאכְלוּ),
> For Jahwè's mouth hath spoken it.'

And he finds them most unexpectedly of all in 2 K 6^{25}: 'And there was a great famine in Samaria: and, behold, they besieged it, until an ass's head was sold for fourscore pieces of silver, and the fourth part of a kab of dove's dung for five pieces of silver.' So the Revised Version. For that is the best that can be made of the present text. 'Surely,' says Professor Cheyne, 'this is hardly what we expect; the narrative is rather painfully interrupted by improbabilities.' So he emends again, and this is the rendering he proposes: 'Now there was a great famine in Samaria (behold, they were besieging it), until a homer of lentils (חֹמֶר עֲדָשִׁים) was sold for fifty shekels (see LXX), and a quarter of a cor (כֹּר) of carob pods (חֲרוּבִים) for five shekels.' And he claims that henceforth we are no longer to charge the Israelites with eating ass's flesh, or rack our ingenuity to show that dove's dung was surely something else.

One of the Revisers, who was also a theological professor, used to entertain his class with anecdotes of the Jerusalem Chamber. The anecdotes derived

their interest from the circumstance of their occupying the lecture hour rather than their own amusement. But there was one that made a distinct impression. Besides the Company that sat round the table, said the Reviser, there was one who was never in the room, but whose word, transmitted mostly by letter, carried more weight than that of any member present. He was too aged and too deaf to be present. He sat in his far-away study and wrote notes which often turned the vote and decided important translations. This mysterious unseen figure, moving the minds that made the Revised Version, caught the imagination of those theological students.

It was Dr. Frederick Field of Norwich. When the Revised Version of the New Testament was issued, on the 17th of May 1881, Dr. Field wrote some notes upon it, which he published three months later under the title of *Otium Norvicense, Pars Tertia.* Rather, he did not publish but printed it, and sent copies to some of his friends. It is a paper-covered, unpretentious quarto of 155 pages. In process of time copies came into the second-hand market. But they were very scarce. One student we know waited for years, and failing to pick up a copy got the use of one from a friend and wrote it out with the hand from beginning to end. *Otium Norvicense, Pars Tertia,* is so often referred to in the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE that it takes its place in the small list of abbreviated titles. It is known as *ON.*

A new edition of *ON* has just been published. It comes from the Cambridge University Press (8vo, pp. xvii, 268, 7s. net), and is edited by Mr. A. M. Knight of Gonville and Caius College. It contains the whole of the original quarto and much more. First there is the Latin Autobiography which Dr. Field prefixed to his edition of Origen's *Hexapla,* in which he traces his descent from Oliver Cromwell, and confesses his deliberate choice of a life of ease and retirement, 'not to indulge a lazy disposition, but to have freedom for such pursuits as I thought I had some proficiency in.' Next there are many additional Notes in their proper place, which were left ready for publication when Dr. Field died in 1885, at the age of eighty-three, together with some footnotes which were found jotted on the margin of his own copy of *ON,* and which consist chiefly of classical illustrations. And, finally, there are two short essays printed at the end of the volume. The one is on 'Conversion' as a scriptural term, the other is on the reading of Acts 20^{24}. Both had been published previously, and have been treasured by many in pamphlet form.

We presume that the old quarto is known. The additions are new and refreshing.

In Mt 11^{28} Dr. Field prefers 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden' to the rendering of A.V., 'All ye that labour and are heavy laden,' which is accepted by R.V. In itself the word (κοπιῶντες) may be translated either way, but the use of the LXX, he holds, is in favour of 'weary.' He quotes 2 S 17^{2}, 'I will come upon him while he is weary (κοπιῶν) and weak handed,' and Is 40^{30}, 'Even the youths shall faint and be weary (κοπιασουσι).'

In Mk 6^{20} A.V. reads: 'For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly.' But for 'he did many things' (πολλὰ ἐποίει) R.V. prefers the reading, 'he was much perplexed' (πολλὰ ἠπόρει). Dr. Field prefers the old reading. The new is supported by great manuscripts (BLℵ), but the old has the support of all the versions except one. He thinks the new reading arose out of another occasion. In Lk 9^{7} it is said that when Herod heard of all that was done by Jesus 'he was perplexed' (διηπόρει). His perplexity in regard to the character and claims of Jesus has been transferred by some early copyist to his relations with the Baptist.

But if 'he did many things' is right, what were the 'many things' which Herod did? The

question is often asked, but to ask it, says Dr. Field, is to miss the point. The point is, not that he did many things, but that there was one thing he would not do. Demosthenes says of a certain king who was threatened with hostilities by a neighbouring power that he sent ambassadors to say he was ready to do everything. We understand that to mean an unconditional surrender. Herod did not make an unconditional surrender. The remark, says Dr. Field, is as old as Elsner that Herod did many things, but not that principal thing which John was urging upon him, he did not send his brother's wife away.

In Lk 2^{12} the shepherds are told that they shall find a babe, and in v.^{16} it is added that they found the babe. Dr. Field wonders that even the Revisers did not catch the distinction. In the first case it is the simple verb 'to come upon' (εὑρήσετε); in the second it is the compound (ἀνεῦρον), which means 'to search and find,' 'to discover.' St. Luke is the only New Testament writer who uses the compound verb, and Hobart pointed out long ago that it is the word used by medical writers of finding out the seat of a disease. In this case it was the seat of the remedy that was found out.

The longest of the new Notes is on Lk 2^{49}. The Authorized Version reads, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' The Revised Version prefers, 'Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?' The words (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου) are certainly susceptible of either translation. Dr. Field gives examples of both. But he holds decidedly by the second.

For, in the first place, he is quite sure that Jesus used words which were perfectly intelligible to His hearers. It is true that His parents 'understood not the saying which He spake unto them.' But that was not because they had any difficulty with its grammatical structure; it was because they did not see its appropriateness in the mouth of the speaker, its bearing on the actual circumstances. At a later period our Lord told His disciples that 'the Son of Man should be delivered unto the Gentiles, and they should scourge Him, and put Him to death, and the third day He should rise again.' There could be no doubt of the grammatical meaning of that sentence; yet we read that 'they understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.'

The words which Jesus used, then, were intelligible to His hearers. And if He spoke in Aramaic, they were intelligible to His Greek translator. But His translator has chosen a phrase which does not at once suggest the meaning 'about my Father's business.' To almost every reader of Greek it suggests another meaning. The presumption is that the words of Jesus distinctly bore that other meaning.

That other meaning is the one chosen by the Revisers. Dr. Field gives many examples of it. Thus in Gn 41^{51} Joseph says, 'God hath made me forget all my toil, and all my father's house.' The Hebrew is unmistakable, as it contains the word for 'house' (וְאֵת כָּל־בֵּית אָבִי), but the LXX is simply, 'and all the of my father' (καὶ πάντων τῶν τοῦ πατρός μου) exactly as in St. Luke.

But if examples do not prove it, then Dr. Field believes that a study of the context will take all doubt away. The complaint of Mary is that they had suffered much anxiety in *seeking* Him. 'How is it,' He replies, 'that ye *sought* me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?' If they had known that, they would not have had to seek, they would have gone straight to the Father's house to find Him. But if he had said, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' that was no answer to their complaint. He might be about the Father's business anywhere, they could not tell where to seek and find Him.

In the war between faith and unfaith there is always some science or other in evidence. At the

present moment it is Anthropology. So the opening article in the current number of the *London Quarterly* is on 'Anthropology and Christianity.' Its writer is Professor Alexander Macalister of Cambridge.

Professor Macalister is scarcely prepared to grant the name of 'science' to anthropology yet. As yet little more has been done by anthropologists than to collect the data of a science. These have not been adequately tested, classified, and compared. In physical anthropology help has come from the cognate branches of biology. But in sociology, in psychology, and in comparative religion 'we are as yet a long way from the reduction of the phenomena to subordination to comprehensive general laws.' But it is just when a science is at this stage that it is dangerous. For then you can make anything of it you please, and use it for any purpose. The popular writers, the writers who purvey for the non-scientific public, are in their best form when the science is in its worst. And it is not surprising to hear Dr. Macalister say that their attacks on Christianity, in the name of anthropology, have received far more attention than they deserved.

At the point where anthropology first touches the doctrine of the Bible, man has made two discoveries. He has discovered God and his own soul. An earlier point of contact is claimed by some in the name of physical anthropology. That point is the creation of man. But Professor Macalister holds that evolution is at present in too fluid a state to base a disagreement with the doctrine of the Bible upon it. All that can be said about the doctrine of derivation, as he calls it, is that it furnishes us with a good working hypothesis which is in accord with such facts as we know of man's structure and history, and serves to unite these facts and make them intelligible. But it is premature to say what form the theory will finally assume. The older crude Lamarckian and Darwinian forms have given place to Weismannism. Weismannism is probably only a preliminary stage towards a more satisfactory form of the hypothesis. All that can be affirmed at present is that there is nothing in physical anthropology which denies a First Cause, nothing which contradicts the biblical narrative of the Creation, if it is critically interpreted.

But when in biblical phrase man stands 'in the Garden of Eden,' anthropology joins hands with the narrative in the Bible. Man has a soul, a sense of responsibility. That sense is awakened in him by a simple taboo—there is a forbidden fruit-tree. The momentous moral decision which man makes in the Garden of Eden, and which is described as the opening of the eyes, is in strict accordance with the findings of anthropology. From that time forth man has a distinct sense of right and wrong, and anthropology has succeeded in showing that there is not on the face of the earth a race or family of man that does not possess that sense.

Professor Macalister hints, as he passes, that we may have to consider our theological language again. He finds we speak of the Fall of Man. He does not find that phrase in the Bible. And he does not say if anthropology will finally countenance it. All he says at present is, that there is complete agreement between the biblical story and the findings of anthropology as to the discovery of man's soul, the development of man's moral sense.

And this leads on to another discovery. The soul of man does not die. How soon after the discovery of the moral sense man discovered its indestructibility we cannot tell. But we know two things. The first is that as far back as the Bible carries us man has the sense of his soul's immortality. The other is that over all the earth man has it still. Anthropology carries us back to the first discovered remains of man. He is already burying his dead in hope of a blessed immortality —sending food, clothing, weapons, companions into the other life along with his dead. And anthropology carries us over the face of the earth.

'It is true,' says Professor Max Müller, 'and I believe has never been contested, that even the lowest savages possess words for body and soul.' 'A belief in the persistence of life after death,' says M. Renouf, 'and the observance of religious practices founded on the belief, may be discovered in every part of the world, in every age, and among men representing every degree and variety of culture.'

The other great discovery is the discovery of God. How soon man discovered God, the Bible does not tell us, and anthropology does not know. When the Bible speaks its opening word, God is there. As far back as anthropology can carry us, God is there. Once more they are in agreement. And that God was there at the beginning, anthropology again assures us, because belief in God is as universal as belief in the soul.

Again Dr. Macalister hints that we may have to revise our terminology. He speaks of the *discovery* of God and of the soul. We have been wont to speak of their *revelation*. He does not object to revelation. He says, indeed, 'The God is revealed to man as he observes His working in nature; the soul is discovered by man as he finds it revealed by introspection into the working of his own life and thought, and by observation of the life and action of his neighbours.' But that is scarcely the conception we have been wont to hold of revelation. We must weigh our words, he seems to say. We may have to change some of the names we give to the facts which the Bible teaches us. With the facts themselves anthropology is in complete accord.

And there are more surprising things than even those that have been named on which anthropology and the Bible agree. Professor Macalister gathers them together at the end of his article. It is enough if we simply state them here. Anthropology finds that mankind universally recognizes the existence of certain obligations on the part of the individual towards God and towards his fellow-men, which are connected with corresponding penalties for breakers of them. The Bible agrees with that. Anthropology finds that among almost all mankind above the very lowest grade of culture, there is a belief in, or an expectation of, the incarnation of the god. The Bible agrees with that. Anthropology finally finds that, coincidently with the belief in incarnation, there is a belief or expectation of the death of the representative of the god and of his rising again, and a further belief that through this resurrection the race is to be benefited. The Bible agrees with that.

At the last moment we have received Professor König's examination of Professor Margoliouth's pamphlet. It speaks for itself. But we may say here that of all the scholars we knew, König and Nöldeke seemed to us most competent to review the pamphlet, and we sent it to Professor König because he had taken no part in the previous controversy over the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus.

New Testament Criticism.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE PROBLEMS.

By Ada Bryson, M.A.

In England, since the time when the Cambridge triumvirate—Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort—turned their attention to textual problems, there have been two great schools,—one using as their test the character of the evidence; the other, that of the quantity of the evidence. For the former, we have Westcott and Hort, followed by most of the textual scholars of to-day; for the other, Dean Burgon (whose work has been lately edited by Miller) is the champion. Dr. Scrivener inclines to Burgon, but declines to say more than that later MSS. are of some account when the older ones really vary. Westcott and Hort's text is the text that most students work with now, and it is the best to trust to. By a process of scientific reasoning they proved the Traditional text, on which the Authorized Version mostly rests, to be the result of a revision or process of revisions, in or about Antioch, in the fourth century. This they describe as the 'Syrian' text,—the earlier types being called respectively, 'Western,' 'Alexandrian,' and 'Neutral,'—and hold to be later in date than the others; in fact, the latest and least authoritative. Whether this 'Syrian' or 'Traditional' text is the oldest is scarcely disputed now. Most critics agree with Westcott and Hort. Within the last few years, however, there has been a feeling that Dr. Hort's preference for the readings of the two great MSS. Aleph and B to the exclusion of all other and better readings goes too far. Yet it is admitted by nearly all that these are our best MSS. The real point at present on which the critics are at issue is whether the Western text does not contain some considerable element of truth. On this point scholars differ. As the Western text and the text represented by Aleph and B (the neutral group) branched off in the second century, it is thought to be quite possible that the right reading may sometimes be preserved in the Western branch, and not in the neutral MSS. Another crux is the Syrian revision. Whether there was any formal revision is very uncertain; the text may have been gradually evolved through a series of revisional processes, but that this formal revision could have taken place in the fourth century, and be unmentioned and unknown by the many Fathers who were flourishing and writing at that time, is very improbable. That this text was evolved in Syria in the fourth century seems, however, pretty certain. 'For,' as Dr. Kenyon says, 'even if we can find no historical reference to a revision, the critical reasons which indicated the separation of the Syrian text from the rest, and its inferiority in date, remain untouched. We still have the groups of authorities habitually found in conjunction; we still have the two facts that the readings of the group we have called Syrian are shown by their intrinsic character to be probably later than the non-Syrian; and that readings of the Syrian type are not found in any authorities earlier than about 250 A.D. Unless these facts can be controverted, the division into groups and the relative inferiority of the Syrian group must be considered to be established.' If Hort's statement that no purely Syrian readings are to be found in the Ante-Nicene Fathers can be disproved, his theory breaks down. But there are no present signs of this. Burgon and Miller rely a good deal on the early date of the Peshitta. This Syriac version is the oldest of all the authorities that belong to the Traditional group. If the Peshitta could be carried back beyond the date of the so-called Syrian revision, then this revision would be proved an invention. But this cannot be done yet; nothing has been found which carries our knowledge of the Peshitta farther back than the beginning of the fourth century. On the contrary, quite recently it has been suggested that the Lewis Codex and the Curetonian represent earlier stages in a long recension of the same Syriac version, of which the Peshitta is a late stage.

Of late years the character of the Western text as exemplified in Acts has especially engaged the attention of textual scholars. Increased importance is attached to this text. All critics agree that the Codex Bezæ—the chief authority for the Western text—deviated from the primitive text; they differ as to the cause. The most striking

feature of this text of the Acts is the presence of a very large number of interpolations or glosses, or rather what must be regarded as such on the hypothesis that the current text does represent the original form of the Acts. Bornemann thought it represented the primitive text of Acts, of which the current text is only an imperfect and mutilated transcript. He was alone in this, until Dr. Blass put forward the latest view that the Bezan and the Received texts are two successive editions of the Acts put forth by Luke himself. This theory is admitted to provide a possible, but not positively probable, explanation of the difficulties. Although it is not yet generally accepted, the number of adherents is said to be steadily growing among scholars. Blass has made it clear that the Western text goes back to a Lukan original, differing in many respects from the Eastern text; but the point of dissension between him and Ramsay is that the latter thinks the Eastern text goes back to the same Lukan original, whereas Blass holds that both the texts are Lukan in their present form. Dr. Harris' theory of the Greek text having been adapted to the Latin, is also only admitted to be a possible explanation. And although it is proved that there was an old Syriac text of the Acts, it is denied that the text was much influenced by this old Syriac. The Syriac origin of the Bezan glosses is very questionable. It is admitted that the whole history of the text requires renewed and careful investigation. There is, however, a good deal to be said for Ramsay's view, that the glosses are by a diligent collector of local traditions, a Greek acquainted with the geography of Asia Minor.

Attempts to distinguish the 'Sources' of the Acts are now decreasing, and yet no sure results have been obtained. The conviction seems gaining ground that in the first part of this book the author did make use of sources,—probably some of them written. But as Ramsay affirms, and here is the crux, the author of the Acts was able to use these sources, and did use them, both skilfully and conscientiously. Baur's standpoint is now generally given up. The view of the Tübingen school was set forth in Baur's *Paulus*. They held that the Gospels and the Acts were literary compositions written with the purpose of inculcating the doctrine of the author's party, and claiming for his own ideas the sanction of the life of Christ. Baur, accepting the spurious literature of the second and third centuries attributed to Clement of Rome and attacking St. Paul as Simon Magus, asserted that the Paulines and Anti-Paulines were bitter opponents: interior idealism was opposed to Judaic externalism. In four of St. Paul's Epistles—which alone are genuine—some symptoms can be interpreted as showing feelings of jealousy towards the older apostles, *e.g.* in Gal 2. There are none in the other nine, which are therefore denied to be genuine. The teaching of St. Paul seemed nearly obliterated at his death, and the Book of Revelation, written probably about 68–69 A.D., is the culmination of Judaical Christianity. In the second century efforts at reconciliation between the two parties began. It is from this time Baur dates the mediating writings, Acts, Epistles, and the 'so-called apostolic Gospels,' of which latter Mark is the most recent and the most suspicious. Pfleiderer, however, in his Hibbert Lectures takes Mark to be the oldest Gospel, and distinctly Pauline; Matthew is the reply to this of Jewish Christianity; Luke once more gives voice to Paulinism, though not the pure Paulinism of the apostolic age, and takes a conciliatory position between Matthew and Mark. The Acts, Baur thinks, is an apologetic essay by a Paulinian, planned to help the approach of the two parties by presenting to the readers a Petrine Paul and a Pauline Peter, and is a late second century work. In this book, especially, are to be seen the results of this work of reconciliation in actual process, *e.g.* the divergences between the narratives of the Jerusalem Conference as given in Acts 15 and Gal 2 are said to show the effort of the author of the Acts to efface the remembrance of the opposition which existed between Paul and the Twelve. In short, Baur's view is: If any book touched on points in the Acts, it was forged to suit the Acts; if it seemed to disagree with Acts, then it was spurious. If the diction is Pauline, it stands forth a proved imitation; if un-Pauline, then it could not have proceeded from the apostle.

Since Baur's time, however, we have had a gradual return to the traditional view. At that time critics took everything to be false unless proved true; now they are inclined to accept the tradition unless it is conclusively shown to be false. Harnack well remarked that during the first two centuries a simple practical letter issued in a false name would have been just as much an intentional forgery then as now. Baur admitted only Romans,

Galatians, and 1 and 2 Corinthians as indisputably genuine letters, but now 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon are generally admitted. Many critics admit Ephesians and Colossians also. Besides these, some have found genuine Pauline fragments embodied in Epistles which as a whole they rejected, such as Colossians and 2 Timothy.

In Romans, the question as to whom it was written, Gentiles or Jews, has again come to the front. Baur answers: To the Jewish majority in Rome; and this view is widely accepted. Weizsäcker, on the other hand, thinks it was addressed to a Gentile community. The question of the integrity of the Epistle is also raised. The best theory seems that advanced by Renan: that Paul wrote a circular letter with no personal allusions, simply a manifesto of doctrine. To this, different endings, were added to suit the various audiences; one copy was sent to Rome, another to the Ephesians and the Thessalonians, and still another to an unknown Church. He traces four distinct endings, which indicate four distinct Epistles. Lightfoot thought that Paul wrote the double greeting and then cut it away, intending to use the letter as a circulatory Epistle.

In 2 Corinthians some scholars have traced the supposed lost letters of Paul to the Corinthians. That referred to in 1 Co 9 would be preserved in 2 Co 6^{14}–7^{1}, and the letter supposed to have been written between our first and second Epistles might be partially preserved in 2 Co 10–12. But all this hypothesis is extremely uncertain. It is not even generally admitted that there is a lost letter here.

For Galatians, Lightfoot is accepted in all except two instances. (1) He is probably wrong in the date he gives. Rendel proves, in the *Expositor* of 1894, that the letter was written before the Jerusalem Conference, and soon before a second visit to Galatia, about 52 A.D. Thus it will probably be the earliest of the now extant Epistles, earlier even than Thessalonians, which has hitherto been taken as the first. (2) Critics have now generally given in their allegiance to Ramsay's South Galatian theory. What are the Galatian churches? Are they those founded by Paul in South Galatia on the first missionary journey? or churches in North Galatia possibly founded by him on the second journey, but of which we have no account? Lightfoot took the latter view, and his opinion was challenged by Renan. Lightfoot replied in a note to his Colossians, and all scholars bent to him. He thought the churches addressed were those in the chief cities of North Galatia—Ancyra, Pessinus, Tavium, etc. But he admitted the other view had much to recommend it. For we have a full account of the founding of the southern churches, and an exhaustive list of them. Also, we can explain the existence of the Jews on the great high road to the West; they would not probably have gone to North Galatia: an unsettled region out of the way of traffic. By their presence the progress of a Judaizing tendency among the Galatians is accounted for, such as the history describes among the Christians of Lycaonia and Pisidia. A few years ago Professor Ramsay came forward with proof that the Galatian district (Ac 16^{6} 18^{23}) denotes not the district popularly and generally known as Galatia, but the Roman province which bore that name. If we refuse to accept this theory, we have no hint of the evangelistic journey, and absolute silence on so important a work as the foundation of the churches of Galatia. Not only so, but all trace of any invitation to join the Jerusalem Fund given to the four southern churches disappears. They were the oldest and best established of them all, 'yet we are asked to believe that they were studiously ignored while the remote and little-known churches of North Galatia were associated with those of Greece and Asia.'

The Epistle to the Colossians is branded as spurious by the Tübingen school. Their real reason is that the letter will not fall in with the scheme of early Church history as drawn up by them. They think it was written by an adherent of the Pauline doctrine, but one who had developed this under the influence of Alexandrian ideas. Some think the writer of Ephesians revised this Epistle. Holtzmann and Pfleiderer do not regard it as Paul's in its present state, but believe it to contain a Pauline nucleus. Holtzmann has advanced an ingenious theory: that Paul wrote an Epistle to the Colossians; that, on the basis of this, a later writer wrote the Ephesians, and was so charmed with the result that he decided to give the original Epistle the benefit of it, and so produced our Epistle to the Colossians. This theory seems too ingenious to be trustworthy. It is said the Epistle presents so many developments in the Pauline doctrine, that it cannot have been written by St. Paul himself. But von Soden maintains that

there is nothing here that goes beyond the possibility of a legitimate development of doctrine in Paul. One might say the teachings are developed but not contradictory; there is nothing inconsistent with what has gone before. The alleged difficulties of language and style are not very significant, and present no serious difficulty. A more historical point is, whether the doctrines against which these teachings are aimed could have developed as early as this. This, as an historical question, should not be pushed too far. An earlier stage of what afterwards became gnosticism — simply then as now the question of the variance between good and evil, why evil should exist—was in the air and troubling the minds of men; and naturally the Colossians took up the question. There was gnosticism in the days of St. Paul as there is gnosticism now, though neither then nor now is it recognized under that specific name. The idea that the origin of these heretics is to be found in Phrygia is now generally given up. Lightfoot was probably wrong in saying there was any connexion between these Colossians and the Essenes. It is more likely that the Colossian heresy came from Alexandria than from Jewish deserts.

With the exception of the Pastoral Epistles, none has been so decidedly rejected as the letter to the Ephesians. Pfleiderer and Holtzmann date it second century, and take it as significant of the desire for union felt then. Renan, von Soden, Hatch, and Davidson all either think it of very doubtful authority or reject it altogether. Its external testimony is excellent: it is pretty certain that the Epistle was in existence before the end of the first century, about 95 A.D.; quite certainly it existed at the beginning of the second century, and by the middle of the second century it was certainly accepted as Pauline. The absence of all personal references is urged against it, as no Church had closer relations with Paul. Also, it is urged that the language and style are quite different from his other Epistles, and even from Colossians; that it contains peculiar words not found elsewhere; and that four or five of the words which are used have a very different sense in the early and undisputed Epistles. These are great difficulties, but not insuperable, and admit of explanation. The theory which is generally accepted now is that of Archbishop Ussher: that this is an encyclical letter sent to the Churches of Asia. There was a blank left purposely instead of the words 'In Ephesus' in the original MS., copies were made for distribution, and the names of the Churches to which it was intended to be sent were duly filled in. This theory seems to offer the only feasible explanation.

Of later years the question of the destination of the Epistle to the Hebrews has been reopened. The problem is not yet solved. In fact, very little about this Epistle is certain. It seems clear it was addressed to a definite Society, and not to Hebrew Christians generally—probably in Palestine, where the priestly aspect of Judaism was dominant. It may have been to the Christians at Jerusalem, Alexandria, or Rome, or at some place unknown. It remains uncertain. The date is put by some shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, but others have put it later in the century. The place of writing and the writer are alike unknown. It is not clear that any among the earliest witnesses attributed the Greek text to Paul, though they thought it Pauline. Origen confessed 'God only knows' the author. The early Church thought it could not well have been written by Paul, as also did Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin at the Reformation. The names of Paul, Clement, Luke, Barnabas, and Apollos have been suggested for the authorship. Luther favoured the latter (Apollos), and this view was held also by Alford, but he is not mentioned as the author by any ancient authority. Barnabas seems the best hypothesis, and he is asserted to be the author by Tertullian. But perhaps it is the best policy to refuse to name anyone. Quite recently a new author for this Epistle has been advocated: the Apostle Peter. The whole question is discussed in *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews* by the Rev. A. Welch.

The Pastoral Epistles are rejected by all advanced critics, though portions of 2 Timothy are accepted by some. If Paul was not released from the imprisonment mentioned in Acts, they cannot be genuine, and it seems probable that he was not. The heresy attacked need not prove a late date, but the style is quite unique and un-Pauline. Their whole tone is different, and great doubt hangs over them, although Drs. Hort and Sanday accept them as genuine. In 2 Timothy are numerous personal details, and the external evidence for it is good, so some critics believe there is a Pauline nucleus in this letter. Of 1 Timothy Beyschlag says: 'The man who is now able to

ascribe it to the author of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians has never comprehended the literary peculiarity and greatness of the apostle.' It is about these Catholic Epistles that present-day critics most disagree. The majority reject 2 Peter and Jude. Those scholars who accept James and 1 Peter as genuine, more and more agree in placing them at the beginning of Christian literature, before the Pauline Epistles.

The Synoptic problem—the most difficult of all—is not now much discussed, unless new matter is forthcoming. Increasing unanimity has been shown amongst German critics in favour of the 'Two Sources' hypothesis, which postulates (1) a narrative preserved by Mark in its most original form, and (2) a collection of the Sayings of Jesus.

There have been four hypotheses: (1) the hypothesis of mutual dependence; (2) that of oral tradition; (3) (α) that of an original document or documents or (β) the so-called 'Two Document Hypothesis.' The first of these, the 'Hypothesis of Griesbach,' is not much in favour now. Whilst accounting for the correspondences between the three Gospels, it does not account for their differences. The second, the 'Hypothesis of Gieseler'—still held by Lange, Alford, Westcott, Farrar, and Godet—postulates the oral tradition of the apostles and of the actions and discourses of Christ as the main source. So, without any preconceived plan, grew up an oral Gospel, from which the Synoptic Gospels were composed in the first century. Of course, 'at bottom, all the Gospels rest on oral tradition or anecdotal reminiscences,' as Holtzmann remarks. Several objections have been urged against this theory, viz. it cannot account for the similarities, even in phrases, which pervade the Gospels. Eye-witnesses of the same event invariably differ in their descriptions of it. There is a definite order followed, which is practically that of Mark, and it is not probable that this was formed in oral tradition. It is asked, Why are passages left out in Mark which are included in Matthew and Luke, if they were all in the oral tradition? And why, if the Gospel resulted from the preaching of the apostles in Jerusalem, was not the account of the ministry in Judæa given fully as in John? It has been further pointed out that the specimens of the teaching of the apostles given us in Acts do not bear out the supposition that their teaching consisted almost entirely in the narratives of Christ's life. The objections to this theory are so strong that it has been given up by most critics, and the third hypothesis is now prevalent. According to this, an original document or documents, probably Aramaic or Hebrew, which all three Gospels made use of, lies at the foundation. This theory has been gradually worked down into what is called the 'Two Document Theory.' One document is a narrative of events in Christ's life, the other a collection of His Sayings. This hypothesis is now most generally accepted, and is said to offer as complete a solution as we can attain to. It has been adopted by, among others, Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, Weiss, Wendt, Beyschlag, Pfleiderer, and Sanday. The first document may be identified with Mark, and this is supported by the statement of Papias, where he says: 'Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, although not in order, whatever he remembered of the things said and done by Christ.' In this record of the preaching of Peter edited by Mark is the first of our fundamental documents, but whether this is Mark's Gospel as we now have it, or a previous document from which our Mark is derived, is still an open question. Concerning Matthew, Papias wrote: 'So then Matthew wrote the oracles (logia) in the Hebrew language.' Here is the second primary document. Evidently this could not have been our present Gospel. It was probably the logia collected by Matthew—hence called by his name—and edited and put into Greek with brief historical notices by some unknown person. It is further disputed whether our Matthew included parts of Mark. Probably Luke had access to Matthew.

A new book on the Synoptic problem is *New Testament Problems*, by Mr. A. Wright of Cambridge, the acknowledged greatest living advocate of the 'oral tradition' theory. He discusses some of the problems found in the Gospels and Acts, and throws interesting light on some difficult texts. Some of his theories, however, will not easily be accepted, *e.g.* he thinks the crucifixion should be dated 29 A.D., and the Gospel of Luke about 80 A.D. He also considers the theory of a one-year's ministry to be attractive.

The decided tendency that there is to give an earlier date to each of the New Testament books should be noted. This is seen in Professor Harnack's latest book, *The Chronology of the Early Christian Literature*. He redates the Gospels and

the Acts. He does the same for the Pauline Epistles, all of which he declares to be genuine except the Pastorals—though even of these he admits portions.

In the Gospel of St. Mark the last twelve verses are generally held not to be genuine. They were not probably composed specially for this place, but seem rather to be a fragment from some other writing roughly fitted on to the end of Mark, and are about as old as the first third of the second century. Why Mark's Gospel has come down to us incomplete is not yet solved. Mark may have been hindered from completing it, or a page of the autograph itself may have been lost. It remains a mystery.

The authorship of the Fourth Gospel is more discussed now, and this question is bound up with that of the first Epistle and the Apocalypse. The author of the first Epistle was almost certainly the author of the Gospel. The question of the Gospel really dates from the Tübingen school. The genuineness of the work is inconceivable from their standpoint: they stand or fall with the denial of its apostolic origin. It is the crown of all the mediating attempts of the second century, in their opinion, and further, the author of the anti-Pauline Apocalypse cannot possibly be the author of this anti-Jewish Gospel. But the discovery of the 'Commentary of Ephraem Syrus' on Tatian's 'Diatessaron' has helped to refute them, and they have been finally driven back from their position. Critics are gradually coming nearer the Johannine authorship, but there is still much variance. Some deny altogether the Johannine authorship, others as decidedly assert it, and some think it was derived from John. Against it are alleged the differences between it and the Synoptics, and its special character as written by an unlearned Galilean fisherman. What most critics stumble at is, as Weizsäcker says, John's 'regarding his whole former experience as a life with the incarnate Logos of God.' Probably if the author was not John he had access to an independent tradition. This is confirmed by the hints in the Synoptists that the ministry was not exclusively Galilean. The question is a good deal mixed up with that of the Apocalypse. Are the Apocalypse and the Gospel both by John? Or, if only one, which one? Further, is the Apocalypse of composite authorship or not? And how has it reached its present form? These are some of the questions asked, and critics are now engaged on them, but there are no certain results yet. Pfleiderer, unlike Baur, who by admitting the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse, drew from it his strongest argument against that of the Gospel, thought the Apocalypse was anti-Pauline, but that it was impossible to deny the Johannine origin of the Gospel, on account of its Christology, without on the same ground denying that of the Apocalypse. The Apocalypse presents the unusual spectacle of being put by the critics at an earlier date than has been claimed for it.

Some Exegetical Studies.

By the Rev. James Wells, D.D., Glasgow.

The Sacred Art of Contemplation.

My last paper invited attention to the four great word-pictures for 'beholding' in the New Testament Greek. These are *κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, to behold in a mirror (2 Co 3^{18}), *ἐποπτεύειν*, to behold as the initiated behold the greatest mysteries (2 P 1^{16}, cf. 1 P 2^{12}), *θεᾶσθαι* and *θεωρεῖν*, to behold as men do in the theatres or at the public games (Jn 1^{14} and 17^{24}). The first of these four words intimates the possibility of contemplation, and the other three reveal its chief features. I am now to *postilize* concerning devout contemplation. Four conditions of it are suggested by these four passages.

1. *Clearness.*—We need a double clearness of the eye and of the object; we behold with face unveiled, and the object beheld lies in brilliant sunshine. Three words of the same family as the above-mentioned quaternion may help us in our study. The whole gospel is an apocalypse, a revelation. The word *ἀποκαλύπτειν* is simple

enough: it is to draw back a veil, and so to disclose what was wrapped round or veiled. When a statue is unveiled, a cord is drawn, the veil falls down, and the chiseled marble stands forth in clearest sunshine. A kindred word is ἐπιφαίνειν. The grace of God, the *philanthropy* of God has appeared, ἐπεφάνη (Tit 2^{11} 3^{4}). We use the same word when we speak of the Epiphany of Christ: His appearing in complete glory. Homer often tells how god or goddess appeared in the cloudless sky above the plains of Troy to rescue a favourite hero. He then used a peculiar adjective—ἐναργής. It expresses both the brilliancy of the form and the distinctness of the outline of the god. Much more than that is suggested by the Epiphany of Christ, and therefore by the revelation of grace through Christ. Φανεροῦσθαι is the third word in this exegetical trinity. 'God was manifested (ἐφανερώθη) in the flesh' (1 Ti 3^{16}). Here, again, we have the same idea of clearness. Add the hundreds of references to truth as light, and remember the utter brightness of light in the East, and the startling definiteness (startling, at least, to a Westlander) which 'yon glaring sun' gives to objects. Further, the initiated was supposed to get a thorough vision of the highest truths of his religion. It is believed that object-lessons were employed, such as the grain dying in the earth, and then springing up to new life. The spectator at the theatre, the amphitheatre, the stadium, and the arena had an unhindered view of all that took place. They were at *spectacles*, which, as the word itself intimates, were nothing except in so far as they were perfectly seen.

Scriptural contemplation therefore implies definiteness and clearness. He mocks me who bids me behold any object at midnight or in a blinding fog. We have not here to do with shifting scenes in cloudland, with a mirage of dreams and illusions, or with some hopeless conundrum in theology. Contemplation is not possible to those who believe that the objects of it are covered with chilling mists. Ours is especially a religion of historical facts,—indeed, all truth is fact in its last analysis,—and fully to realize these facts and adjust ourselves to them is the aim of devout contemplation. True, it must imply a certain kind of mysticism, and a great deal of it. For we apprehend what we cannot comprehend; we know that certain facts are, though we cannot fully know what and why they are. Everything in this region, as the old divines used to say, goes off into the unknown. We are encircled by ineffable and illimitable mysteries, and should therefore be withal very humble and reverent. We have a little circle of light with an unexplored circumference of mystery. A sanctified imagination may, if it will, make excursions into the dim regions around, provided that it never severs its connexion with its sun-illumined starting-point. True mysticism is the companion of a firm faith in the historical Christ. Faith offers it a firm support, and it enlarges and ennobles faith.

In the last chapter of his *Idylls of the King*, Tennyson describes Arthur's last dim weird battle of the West. It was on the last day of the dying year. A death-white mist slept over land and sea, and chill and confusion came even upon the king. Friend and foe were mere quivering shadows in the mist, and were mistaken by each other. Arthur had still Excalibur, with which he struck his last stroke. He slew his foe, and then, all but slain himself, he fell. That is a true and affecting picture of those whose religion has become a vague mystic poetry, because they have let go their hold of the Christ of the New Testament.

Some religious writers might adopt the confession of Turner, the painter: 'Indistinctness is my forte.'

The ancient prayer of Moses befits us, 'I beseech Thee, *show* me Thy glory.' The saintliest saint is more than a knower, he is a seer; and his bright visions of truth make him what he is. Here is the secret of the lives of the early Christians, 'And we beheld His glory.'

2. *Admiration.* As our four Greek words show, the Christian student is to study sacred truth admiringly; for he is, in this respect, to resemble those who spent the happiest hours of their life in the theatres and at the public shows. The most common word for 'good' in the New Testament is καλὸν. It means the fit and fair, the noble, but specially the beautiful. In the highest region, ethics and æsthetics become one. Divine truth should be both delightful to the heart and glorious to the imagination. Rightly apprehended, it is 'a thing of beauty' and 'a joy for ever.' We are to make one thing of truth, goodness, and beauty. We need not separate truth and beauty as Mrs. Browning does—

> Poets die for beauty, as martyrs for truth.

Nor need we simply confound them as Shelley does when he sings—

> Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty. That is all
> Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

We live by admiration, another poet tells us. This admiration has in it, in germ at least, many elements: wonder, surprise, joy, love; and all these reach their perfection and unite, in adoration. This genial and delighted appreciation of Divine truth is one of the chief notes of saintliness. Faith feeds our sense of wonder and gratifies our appetite for the immense. It makes the mind a native of wonderland. Christ is 'the wonderful,' or, more literally, 'the wonder.' 'Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.' 'We can't approach Shakespeare's plays,' says an enthusiast, 'without some prostration of the understanding.' Should anyone, then, approach the burning bush with shoes on? Θεᾶσθαι denotes a wondering, admiring regard, such as the Greeks had in their *θέατρον*; and hence the seven wonders of the world were called *τὰ ἑπτὰ θέαματα*. Admiring wonder begets love and joy. If the sages called the student a philosopher or lover of wisdom, the true exegete may hope for a share of the love of wisdom and the wisdom of love. Successful study is *con amore*. This phrase was invented by the great painters of Italy in the sixteenth century. They believed that their masterpieces were created by an enthusiastic love which roused and increased all their powers. This law applies to all work of the higher order. 'The right question about all ornament,' writes Ruskin, 'is, Was it done with enjoyment; was the artist happy when he did it?'

If a boy comes to love learning, his education is, in a sense, already completed; at least, he may be left to himself after that. Love is the best of all teachers.

Admiration, wonder, love, joy—these lead up to, and are consummated in, adoration.

One sometimes asks why Plato has had such an enormous power over great Christian thinkers both in ancient and modern times. John Howe and Archbishop Leighton, for example, were his avowed disciples, and they often reproduced his favourite ideas and phrases. The whole stream of their discourse is both coloured and *tasted* by the bed of ancient ore over which it runs. The secret of Plato's power lies in the fact that he so adores truth, and exults in its beauty and creative power. His *summum bonum* he called *the true, the beautiful, and the good.* With him, of course, it was only *it*, and not *He*. He teaches that, in order to know the truth, we must love it with a pure and supreme affection. What is called 'platonic love' is very like the love of wisdom commended in the Bible. It is the fullest life of a soul enamoured of universal excellence. It is an inspiration, a passion, a noble madness. Mania is his Greek word for it. It is a ravishing vision of the truth, heightened by mystery; it is 'a fine frenzy,'—reason-on-fire, the intensest devotion of the soul to the truth, its one chosen bride. He tries to kindle a rapturous admiration—the *victrix delectatio*—of the Divine excellence. This soul-mastering generous love is the bond of union between man and the truth, between man and God. He expects all things from this love, which is his one grace and saving principle. With him, the tree of this knowledge is the tree of life. The true adorer of the idea resembles what he realizes, shares what he sees, becomes what he beholds, and so grows in likeness to God. He soars above the vulgar sense-bound throng, and rises to the highest life possible to man. The ideas supply him with a working ideal, which has a prophetic and inspiring power. He only is the true doer who, while toiling wearily in the darksome vale of the actual, ever lifts his eyes with longing to the sunlit summits of the eternal and the ideal.

One thus sees how readily Plato's teaching lends itself to Christian uses. Of all the teachers of heathendom, he rose to the truest conception of the power of devout contemplation. And does not the sage rebuke the saint? When one compares his devotion to the truth with that of the average Christian, one is reminded of the exclamation of the poet—

> In Christian hearts, oh for a pagan zeal.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Loofs on the Creation-Narrative.

An admirable example of the hallowing of criticism is given by Professor Loofs of Halle in No. 39 of the series of present-day pamphlets[1] which are being published as 'Hefte zur Christlichen Welt.' The narratives of the Creation, the Fall of Man, and the Building of the Tower of Babel, form the respective themes of three academic sermons, which are no dry, abstract discussions, but practical discourses in which difficult subjects are treated with tactful wisdom and spiritual insight. Sometimes with rare skill the results of criticism are shown to be destructive, not of faith, but of theories which interpret these stories as uninspired myths. Preachers who have avoided the early chapters of the Book of Genesis, and whose point of view may not be that of Loofs, may learn from his devout expositions that these old biblical stories are full of present truth, and are indeed 'Scripture inspired of God, and profitable for instruction which is in righteousness.'

In this notice a summary of the sermon on the Narrative of Creation will be given. In the introduction Loofs speaks with genuine pathos of the hundreds of thousands of simple folk who have been taught that the story in Genesis is a foolish myth. In 'The Bible in the Waistcoat Pocket,'—a little book, widely circulated by the social democrats,—the creation of the world is described as a 'natural event of which when the Bible was written no man, least of all the uneducated Jews, could know anything; the tradition handed down to us consists of some misunderstood scraps picked up from other nations, and this tradition is still being drummed into our children as pure truth.' When such teachings are constantly being 'drummed into' the people, the Christian pulpit ought wisely but frankly to deal with the question of the origin of the Bible story.

Is the narrative of Creation itself a creation of the author's imagination? That cannot be, for then it would be inexplicable that amongst other nations of that time there should exist stories which in many details remind us of the Bible narrative.

Is the story in all its details a supernatural revelation to the author of events which no man witnessed? Divine revelation has ever in view our salvation, its purpose is not to impart scientific information. Moreover, the variations in the two narratives found in the first two chapters of Genesis prove that neither was regarded as inspired in all its details.

Archæological research has shown that the background of the Old Testament narrative consists of ancient traditions similar to those which were current in neighbouring nations, especially amongst the Babylonians. Hence the significance of the Hebrew account of Creation must lie not in its agreements with, but in its differences from, the Babylonian account as it has been deciphered from the cuneiform inscriptions.

In what respects is the biblical narrative unique? The Creation stories of other nations include the gods in their account of how the world came into being. 'Of old,' says a Babylonian inscription, 'when the heavens above were not named and the earth beneath bore no name . . . of old, when none of the gods existed, then were the gods created.' How striking the contrast with those majestic words: 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' God *was*, when all things had their beginning, that is the one eternal truth which Israel learnt from the Creation-narrative.

The second truth taught in the Hebrew story of Creation, and in that alone, is that this one God did not form the world out of material already existing: 'God said, Let there be light: and there was light.' How could the great truth that the world had its origin in the free creative will of God be more plainly and intelligibly expressed than in those sublime yet simple words? Therefore, so far from the Bible narrative of the Creation being a collection of 'fragments of the wisdom of other peoples,' as the social democrats declare, it makes known two profound truths, the knowledge of which was Israel's peculiar glory amongst the nations.

But granted that the Hebrew narrative of Creation is vastly superior to the heathen myths of the

[1] *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte, der Sündenfall und der Turmbau zu Babel in drei im akademischen Gottesdienst zu Halle gehaltenen Predigten behandelt.* Von Dr. F. Loofs, Professor der Theologie in Halle. Williams & Norgate.

origin of the gods and men, has not the science of the nineteenth century made it antiquated and obsolete? How much is now known about the evolution of the universe of which the pious Israelite had no conception, and how different the meaning of 'the world' to him and to us! Science tells us that the sun is older than grass and herbs, and that the processes of Creation require, not six days, but thousands of years; are we therefore to regard her teachings as delusive errors? That would be to exchange the knowledge which God has enabled men to discover for traditions which Israel possessed in common with heathen nations. On the other hand, the manifold attempts to read into the ancient story the discoveries of modern science are failures, because such cannot have been the meaning which the author of the narrative attached to its words.

The unique element in the Bible story of Creation is not affected by the teachings of science. For us, as for the Israelite of old, the existence of the world remains a riddle. Evolution cannot explain beginnings. To call Creation a 'process of nature' assumes the existence of nature; and those who say nature existed from eternity no more evade the difficulties of the problem than the ostrich escapes its enemies by hiding its head in the sand.

For our belief that this world is the creation of Almighty God, and that He whose free will called it into existence still sustains it by His power, we have a more sure foundation than the author of Genesis. To know Christ as the goal of the ages, is to know that the world exists in order that the eternal counsel of the God of our salvation may be fulfilled; faith in the Almighty Creator is inseparable from faith in the God of redemption.

J. G. Tasker.

Handsworth College.

Kautzsch's 'Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen.'

Since our last notice of this important work (published by J. C. B. Mohr, Freiburg i. B., and procurable, only by subscribers, at a cost of about 15s. for the whole), another issue has appeared, comprising *Lieferungen* 7–10. The literature dealt with is as follows:—The 'Additions to Esther' by Ryssel, the 'Book of Baruch' and the 'Epistle of Jeremy' by Rothstein, the 'Book of Sirach' down to 18[17] by Ryssel. The names of Ryssel and Rothstein are a sufficient guarantee of the quality of their work, which is worthy to stand side by side with that of the editor, Professor Kautzsch, himself. In particular we may refer to the very careful treatment of the many important questions connected with Sirach, the recently recovered Hebrew fragments of which receive the attention from Professor Ryssel to which they are entitled. The present issue certainly reaches the high standard for which one looks in such a work.

Bertholet on 'The Hebrew Notions of the State after Death.'[1]

Professor Bertholet has done well in publishing in pamphlet form this lecture. The notions regarding the state after death which prevailed in Israel constitute a fascinating subject, on which much light has been thrown by Stade, Schwally, and others. It is a pity the theological pamphlet is not popular among English readers, else we should have had no hesitation in recommending the translation of this little work, which contains nothing but what would be perfectly intelligible to educated laymen. But as such an event is scarcely likely to be realized, the pamphlet may be very warmly commended to all who can read German. Even those who have studied larger works, like Schwally's *Leben nach dem Tode*, will find conclusions already familiar to them presented in a most convenient form, and will not infrequently meet with original and attractive suggestions of the author's own. The pamphlet commences by introducing us to the scene in an Israelitish home immediately after a death has taken place, describes the various observances, such as the closing of the eyes of the deceased, the rending of the clothes, the shaving of the hair and beard, the holding of the funeral meal, etc. etc., and accounts for these as for the most part at least survivals of ancestor worship, although their original meaning had been largely lost before historical times. There is much on other subjects as well which will repay careful study.

[1] *Die Israelitischen Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode.* Von A. Bertholet a. o. Prof. der Theol. in Basel. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr. Price 75 pf.

Benzinger on the 'Books of Kings.'[1]

THE *Kurzer Hand-Commentar* continues to make steady progress, and each succeeding volume shows no falling off in quality from its predecessors. It goes without saying that the commentary on Kings fell into excellent hands when it was assigned to the learned author of the *Hebräische Archäologie*. In addition to the *Einleitung* and commentary proper, the book contains nine figures, meant as tentative illustrations of Solomon's buildings or of the furnishings of the temple, as well as a plan of ancient Jerusalem, and a Comparative Table showing the contemporary history of Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, and Damascus.

Benzinger holds the Books of Kings in their present form to have undergone two processes of redaction, the one before, the other during, or after the Exile. The mention in 2 K $25^{27ff.}$ of the release of Jehoiachin by Evil-merodach brings us down only to 561 B.C., but there is no reason, as Benzinger points out, why this note should not have been written *after* the Exile, the Return being unmentioned because it constituted the beginning of the new period and not the close of the old, and was therefore irrelevant from the writer's point of view. Exilic and post-exilic traces are plainly discoverable also in other passages, notably 1 K 8. 9^{1-19}, 2 K 17^{21} (partly) 22^{15-20} etc. On the other hand, there are passages (*e.g.* 1 K 8. $11^{29ff.}$, 2 K $8^{18f.}$ 17^{7-23}) due to a redactor who wrote between 621 and 597 B.C., *i.e.* subsequent to the Fall of the Northern Kingdom but prior to the Captivity of Judah. Both redactions are of a strongly Deuteronomistic tinge. The pre-exilic redactor (R^1) is the 'author' of the book in the sense that it was he that compiled the material from the different sources. Then his work received various expansions and modifications at the hands of R^2 and possibly others during the Exile and subsequently to it.

The Text of Kings and the Chronology both receive careful treatment from our author, who also appends a pretty full Bibliography, which we may supplement by the mention of the extremely careful article on KINGS (BOOKS OF) in vol. ii. of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Mr. Burney, whose *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* will be published shortly by the Oxford University Press.

The Commentary itself is an admirable piece of work, whether we look to the author's own conclusions or to the abundant data which enable the student to form an independent judgment for himself. We naturally turn with interest to see how Benzinger treats the narrative of Josiah's reforms and of the finding of the Book of the Law. On the latter question the brevity which characterizes the *Kurzer Hand-Commentar* prevents our ascertaining very clearly what our author thinks about the real character of the part played by Hilkiah, and about some other burning questions. But he is clear enough that the whole passage 2 K 22^{1}–23^{30} has undergone serious modifications and transformations at the hands of redactors. This remark he considers to apply to what is left even after the separation of such additions as $22^{5b.\ 6}$ $23^{4b.\ 5.\ 7b.\ 8b(?)\ 14.\ 16-20}$ and glosses like הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל, 22^{8}, etc. The oracle of Huldah he attributes to the later redactor. In its original form the reply of the prophetess to Josiah's deputation must have been of a more favourable character, for Josiah and his subjects both seem to have looked for material prosperity as the result of the carrying out of the enactments of the Law book. The fatal day of Megiddo changed all this, and the original prophecy had to be altered to suit the subsequent historical situation, just as the same redactor had in other cases to harmonize certain promises with the fact of the Exile. Benzinger believes, too, that the original account of Josiah's passover has been replaced by a later composition, but he is not inclined to agree with those who would make practically the whole even of the original story of the Reformation an invention of the earlier compiler of the Books of Kings.

Like all the commentaries of this series, this one of Benzinger's will be found reliable, up to date, and in every way serviceable to the student of the Old Testament.

[1] *Kurzer Hand-Commentar z. A.T.* Die Bücher der Könige. Von I. Benzinger. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. Subscription price, 3s. 6d.; non-subscribers, 5s.

Köberle on 'The Temple Musicians.'[2]

THE temple music of the O.T. is a subject regarding which there is much difference of

[2] *Die Tempelsänger im A.T.* Ein Versuch zur isr. u. jüd. Cultusgeschichte. Von Lic. Justus Köberle. Erlangen: Fr. Junge, 1899. Price M.4.

opinion. Its history, and in particular the extent to which it was introduced and regulated in the first temple, is involved in much obscurity. The work before us is an attempt, and the author very modestly insists that it is nothing more, to enlighten this obscurity as far as possible. We certainly are of opinion that there is a good deal in his work to which exception may be taken, but we must accord a hearty tribute to the exhaustive and painstaking examination to which he subjects all the O.T. passages that bear upon his subject. If one's conclusions may differ from those of Köberle, he will feel indebted to the latter all the same for setting the evidence in such a clear light for the reaching of an independent judgment.

The work is divided into four chapters, of which the first deals with the period of Israelitish history down to the Return from Exile, the second with the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the third with the evidence of the Chronicler, and the fourth with the names Asaph, Jedithun, Heman, and Korah. Some of the main conclusions he reaches are the following:—From very early times song and music were naturalized in Israel, and found the most varied employment in the service of religion. There are numerous indications that in the time of Samuel, and, above all, of David, a great impulse was given to sacred music. Köberle sees no convincing reason for denying that David personally contributed to this movement as a singer, an inventor of musical instruments, and even as a composer of religious lyrics. — 'Levites' was a general term for all those who were occupied with the cultus. But while pre-eminently an official title, it had from the first also a genealogical sense, and in course of time this last attained always more emphasis. At the reformation by Josiah the word 'Levites' ceased to be a distinctive genealogical term for those entitled to exercise the priestly office, and became the technical designation of the highest class of subordinate cultus officials, the other two classes being the singers and the doorkeepers.—Towards the end of the monarchy the title 'sons of Korah' as = 'singers' had been displaced by the term 'sons of Asaph.' These last were apparently, to begin with, a branch of the Korahites, but in course of time had practically usurped a monopoly of the singers' office, while the rest of the Korahites became doorkeepers. — Another family, which presently appears alongside of the sons of Asaph, is that of the sons of *Jedithun*, whose origin, whether they were a branch of the Benê Asaph or directly descended from a 'Levitical' family (Merari), Köberle leaves uncertain. It is not improbable that Nehemiah found a collection of songs of the past which for a considerable period had been employed in the temple worship. These included especially compositions attributed, partially at least with some justification, to David and Asaph. Regarding others, all that was known was that they emanated from the circle of the singers at a period when the latter were designated 'sons of Korah.' *Heman* is the latest of the three classes. It included the most numerous and the most distinguished families of singers, while Asaph perhaps comprised the most ancient. Köberle doubts whether it is correct to say that the liturgical and other arrangements which in the books of Chronicles are attributed to David, are simply those that prevailed in the Chronicler's own day.

All the above positions Köberle seeks to establish by close and careful arguments, which merit the attention of all students of the Old Testament.

J. A. Selbie.

A Sermon for the Young.

By the Rev. T. C. Sturrock, B.D., Edzell.

'Be clothed with humility.'—1 Pet. v. 5.

'Be clothed.'—Our text speaks of clothing, and tells us of one particular garment that we should wear—'Humility.'

Dress or clothing is a very interesting subject to most people. Some people find it necessary to consider the subject very carefully, because of the difficulty of getting the money with which to buy clothes; and other people who have no difficulty as to where the money is to come from, give the question of dress a good deal of consideration, because they are very particular about the colour and shape of their clothes, and the material of which they are made.

But our text does not speak of that kind of clothing—the clothing which we put on in the morning and take off at night; the clothes which we buy with money, which wear out and require to be renewed. The dress spoken of in our text is got without money, and does not wear out, but becomes finer and more durable the longer we wear it. It is the clothing of the soul; the dress worn by the person that inhabits the body, not that worn on the body.

If you were asked the difference between a bad boy and a good boy, you would perhaps reply that a bad boy is one who steals or swears or lies, and a good boy one who is honest and pure and truthful. We might put it in this way: A bad boy has vices, bad habits; a good boy has virtues, good habits. The vices are the clothes worn on the bad boy's soul or heart; the virtues clothe the good boy's heart.

In the third chapter of Colossians, Paul speaks of this clothing of the soul. He tells his readers to put on the garments of pity, kindness, humility, meekness, forbearance, long-suffering, forgiveness, and to put around them all the girdle or belt of Love.

That dress is never taken off. We don't put on a garment called Forgiveness when we get up in the morning, and take it off when we go to bed at night. No; a man who is ready to forgive is a forgiving man awake or asleep.

These garments do not wear out, as I have said already; for if we go on wearing any of them, we find that a wonderful thing takes place. We might say that the garment ceases to be a garment, and becomes part of us. If we begin to try and be kind, and go on being kind, saying kind words, doing kind deeds, we find it becoming easier for us to be kind. Kindness becomes a garment that clings so close to us that it cannot come off. We are kind more readily than unkind. It becomes our nature to be kind, and against our nature to be unkind. The garment of Kindness goes to make part of what we call Character.

We might give an illustration. A lady was going along a street, and in front of her was a boy newly out of school, and he seemed to be very merry and somewhat noisy, as boys newly out of school will be. Suddenly the boy stopped, bent down, and picked up a banana skin which was lying on the pavement, and as he put it out of the way, said, 'Somebody might slip on it and hurt themselves.' That boy had on a garment called 'Thoughtfulness for others,' and the longer he wore it, the oftener he did thoughtful kindly deeds, the better the garment would become, and would in time become part of himself, part of his character.

Perhaps you have read *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. If so, you will remember that when the boy called Arthur, who became Tom's friend, and exercised such a good influence over him, came to school, he knelt down at night in his dormitory before the other boys and said his prayers. The boys were not given to that sort of thing, and some of them sneered at Arthur, and others would have bullied him if Tom had not prevented them. Arthur did not give up saying his prayers, for he had on a garment called Moral Courage.

Our text speaks of a particular garment called Humility. What is Humility? It is not easy saying what it is. It is easier saying what it is not. It is not something that keeps a boy from being strong and manly and brave. It is the opposite of proud. You know what is meant by a proud boy or a proud girl. A boy who thinks himself better than his companions because his father is rich, or because he himself is better dressed or more clever than others. A humble boy or girl is the opposite of proud.

Our text tells us something about this garment called 'Humility.' 'Be clothed' is one word in Greek, and comes from a word meaning a knot—the verb means 'to tie on with a knot'—and so it means that Humility is like a cloak that we put on us and tie on by means of a cord or belt round our waist—a cloak that we draw on over other garments. We can therefore say these things about the garment of Humility—

(1) It does not hinder us from having on fine garments. Many beautiful garments may peep from under it, just as a peep of the gold lace and the scarlet coat is sometimes had under the dark cloak which an officer in the army wears. We may be clever, brave, and yet be humble; but we should not be proud of what we are. We should wear these garments humbly, *i.e.* covered with the garment of Humility.

(2) It is a garment that fits everybody. Nobody can say that it is too small for them—high and low, rich and poor. We have all need to be humble, for, after all, what have we to be proud about? If we are clever, God has made us so. If we have money, we have to thank God for it. What have we that we have not received? One thing to make us all humble is, that we are all sinners before God.

(3) It is a garment that suits everybody. It looks well on everybody. How sick we get of proud and boastful people. We don't like those who are stuck up and think themselves better than other people. We admire clever and brave people, but not those who boast about what they are. Humility looks well on everybody, and makes us admire clever and brave people all the more.

(4) It is a garment that protects everybody. Clothing protects the body from the heat and cold and wind and rain. The garment of Humility protects the soul, the man, from being injured by men. We know that proud people expose themselves to much that is not pleasant. They tempt people to take the pride out of them. Their gaudy dress of pride attracts attention that is apt to prove uncomfortable and dangerous. And, moreover, their want of humility makes them easily hurt. They lack protection to their hearts. Proud people are so very sensitive. Touchy we call it.

Jack the Giant-Killer had shoes of swiftness—how he could run when he had them on! He had also a cloak of darkness, and could go about seeing but unseen. Humility is a cloak of darkness, not in the bad sense of enabling us to go about and do mischief without being seen, but in the good sense of enabling us to go about the world doing our daily duty and enjoying what life has for us without attracting attention that would be unpleasant and hurtful. The people who do not think too much of themselves slip unnoticed about the world, and do very good work, and are very happy and wonderfully successful.

We have an example of humility in Jesus Christ, the meek and lowly One, who was yet the Son of God. We get this garment of Humility, as we get all the other garments of the soul, from that same Jesus. We would naturally be proud, and we need to ask Him to give us the meek and lowly heart.

Humility is not a strange subject to speak to children about. Pride appears very soon, and we cannot begin to dress ourselves in the beautiful garment of Humility too early. It is not a man of ripe experience, but a boy that John Bunyan in his *Pilgrim's Progress* pictures as saying—

> He that is down need fear no fall,
> He that is low no pride,
> He that is humble ever shall
> Have God to be his Guide.

The Hittite Inscriptions.

By Professor P. Jensen, Ph.D., Marburg.

When in the June number of The Expository Times I declared my intention to decline for the present any further controversy with Professor Hommel, I was entitled to expect that the latter would do his best to facilitate my purpose by confining himself, in any polemic directed against me, strictly to objective facts. This expectation has not been realized in his 'Reply' in the July number, and hence I find myself compelled, to my sincere regret, to ask once more for the kind indulgence of the Editor and the readers of The Expository Times while I devote a few words more to our *querelles allemandes*.

If Professor Hommel had observed more accurately what he himself, what Professor Ramsay, and what I have said hitherto in The Expository Times, and what Professor Zimmern has said about his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, he might have spared a good many of his strictures upon me, or would have in some instances expressed himself somewhat differently. He would have seen—(1) (cf. p. 459) that *no human being*, without the aid of his (Hommel's) commentary, could have referred the 'absurdities' of which he spoke in the May number (p. 371) to anything else than *the whole* of the foregoing remarks directed against my views; (2) (cf. p. 459 f.) that in my words on p. 410 of the June number *no* suspicion is implied; (3) (cf. p. 460) that of course I did *not* say that the name *Tarkhunazi* was unknown to Hommel; (4) (cf. p. 460) that I *did not assert* that, but on the contrary left it doubtful whether, the Egyptian *Ḳode* includes Cilicia; (5) (cf. p. 461) that Ramsay's expression, 'extraordinary misrepresentations,' had *not* the reference that Hommel gives it; (6) (cf. p. 461) that I am *far from* regarding the discovery of a hieroglyph for 'queen' (or 'mistress') as anything considerable. I have now learned for the first time from Hommel that Menant in this particular has preceded me. Some day, perhaps, it may be recognized that I was justified in not troubling about Menant's work on the Hittite inscriptions. I may, however, remark once again that 'Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem.' For the hieroglyph in question I deduced the meaning 'queen' on the strength of a passage, which Menant, in his paper, could not yet turn to account. So little, however, does his interpretation of the sign rest upon any logical ground, that immediately following in his list he provisionally renders the same sign as 'high priest.' But as to the distinction between groundless assertions and logical conclusions, Hommel and I are, to be sure, not at one. (7) (cf. p. 461) that in the passage in my article cited by Hommel I did not allege that the famous determinative preceding 'Cilicia' is the picture of a city, but of a city *along with the surrounding district*; (8) (cf. p. 462) that I did *not* say that Hommel's explanations are for the most part based on my decipherments, and indeed could not have said this, seeing that I know nothing about the article he announces as forthcoming in the *P.S.B.A.*, although I certainly believe that hitherto *he* has not furthered the work of decipherment, and that he can further it only by continuing in the future, as he has done in the past, to adopt from me one result after another; finally, (9) (cf. p. 459) that my judgment of his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* stands in *no* contradiction with that expressed by Zimmern. The latter recognizes 'Gutes und Neues' in the book, and so do I in my critique, which will appear shortly, in which I say: 'The expert and he who is competent to judge may learn from it in many ways, and often derive stimulus to fruitful reflexion.' But Zimmern considers that the conclusions which Hommel draws from his materials are of very different values, and at the same time regrets that he 'has not restricted himself to submitting his materials *sine ira et studio*, but has at the same time proceeded to use these with an avowedly apologetic aim,' and it is the way in which Hommel from the first line of his book to the last has done this, while only too frequently he presents the airiest speculations as irrefutable facts—it is this which I have called 'absurd,' and it seems to me that I have at least as much right to do so as Hommel has to apply that term, in view of his own interpretation, to a modest *suggestion*—which, by the way, I have since abandoned—of mine concerning *Tarkhu* and *Atargatis*, and to a very well-grounded conclusion in favour of the existence of a '*Teshup* population,' as distinguished from a '*Tarkhu* population,' in Northern Syria and the adjacent districts. I have called attention to the fact that in numerous

personal names compounded with the divine name *Tarkhu*, the divine name uniformly comes first, while in others—the number of which has meanwhile been somewhat increased by fresh discoveries—compounded with *Teshup*, it stands uniformly in the second place. Further, it is established that, for the periods of time accessible to us, the first class of names is unexampled to the east of the Euphrates, and the second to the west of the Taurus. Hence I conclude that two distinct populations were found in Northern Syria and the adjacent districts. If Hommel calls *that* 'absurd,' his terminology, as happens, indeed, in many other instances as well, is different from what is generally current. If *such* conclusions are absurd, the same term must be applied to a great many scientific inferences in which one has till now seen an enrichment of our knowledge. And which of Hommel's own conclusions, then, would not be absurd? By the way, I now learn from Hommel for the first time that by his arguments in the *P.S.B.A.* (xix. p. 79 ff.) he has overthrown my position. I have even failed, after repeated reading of these, to discover how, even if it be granted that we are to take seriously such identifications of Hommel (*loc. cit.*) as *Mars-Mavors* (genitive *Martis*, *Mavortis*!) = *Maura* in Hittite (!) *Maura-ser-*. Or, does he hold to *Ḫattu-shar*, a form of name which goes back to the authority of Winckler, but is as good as impossible, in preference to the incomparably more probable *Ḫattuḫi* (or *Ḫattuti*)? I should have thought, by the way, that the first of all requisites for fair controversy was a conscientious statement of how far one has evidence for the counter positions he maintains.

As to the extremely meagre objections Hommel has to offer to my 'Reply,' the following may be said in brief. No one except Hommel (see p. 460) has hitherto inferred from names like *Tarkhu-lara*, Ταρκυ-αρι-ς, Τροκο-αρβασι-ς, Ταρκυ-μ-βι-ης, Ταρκο-ν-δημος, etc., nor could he have inferred that the first common part of the names, instead of being *Tarkhu-*, Ταρκυ-, Τροκο- (**Trkho-*) is *Tarkond-*. The form *Tarkond-* is—I may mention for the benefit of readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES not acquainted with the facts—created by Hommel *ad hoc*, in order to lend more weight to his famous identification of the word with δράκων, δράκοντος. What name is one to give to such a procedure, and what is one to say by way of answer to it?

On none of my casts, squeezes, or photographs have I been able to discover *any trace* that the hieroglyph for 'Cilicia' has not precisely the same appearance on the right and on the left, or that it shows on the one side a thickening which might represent a serpent's head, and on the other a thinning which might indicate his tail. And of the different forms of this ideogram that which is given by Hommel with approximate correctness is—according to my inferences—not only the oldest but at the same time also that which is most like the figure of a serpent. There are forms such as (the Cilician form) , and which do not at all resemble a serpent. By this I do *not* mean to say that the hieroglyph may not have been originally the picture of a serpent. But I may venture the assertion that this hieroglyph itself does not justify such an assumption.

As to *Syennesis*, Hommel, then, frankly admits (p. 460) that formerly he found, with me, in the second *s* of the word a radical consonant. But in his first article he spoke of this view of mine as extremely improbable. Why this change of mind? It appears—for it cannot be well conceived of otherwise—to have unconsciously arisen *along with* or *through* the conviction that I had made a mistake in my reading of x+y+z+x as = *Syennes-i-s*. But in that case he ought not to support this last opinion by appealing to that other.

His new objection (p. 460) to the title *Syennesis* is equally wide of the mark. It is quite true that *Syennesis*, son of *Oromedon*, was commander of the Cilician contingent in the second Persian War. But why this Syennesis may not have been king of the Cilicians one fails to see. In the opinion of my colleague, Professor Niese, the historian, the internal probability is all in favour of the admiral of the Cilicians having been also their king and satrap, to which it must further be taken into consideration that we know with absolute certainty of three kings of Cilicia who bore precisely this (throne) name *Syennesis*. And if the father of Syennesis of the second Persian War is called *Oromedon* and not *Syennesis*, this is no proof that *Syennesis* was a personal name and not a title. For—as one can assume without difficulty, and as has been assumed by others before me—the royal title may have been borne only by the living reigning king. To what an extent the Cilician royal title—only as such is it established—x-y-z-x, read by me as *Syennes-i-s*, forced the individual name into the background

may be perceived by any one, even without any knowledge of the meaning of the inscriptions. In the inscription of Bor it is the first word, and according even to Hommel, the real name only comes in later! Other circumstances tending to prove the same I cannot notice here, because I should have to presuppose such an intimate acquaintance with the inscriptions as is possessed by no one of the certainly small number who have occupied themselves with these at all.

As to *Ḳode* (p. 460), Hommel might be right in holding that it is a native word for the district it designates and not an Egyptian word, if he could really *prove* its occurrence in non-Egyptian inscriptions. Several years ago I myself, like Hommel, thought of a connexion between *Ḳode* and the *mātāti kutiti* of one of the Tell el-Amarna letters (sent by one of his subjects to the *Egyptian* king!). But this connexion is not demonstrable, because, in spite of Hommel's confident assertion, we do not know what is meant by *Kutiti* nor even precisely by *Ḳode*. And if Hommel, on account of the position of the word *kutiti* between *Khāti* and *Mitanni*, draws an inference as to the situation of the territory designated by it, he will see, on looking at the passage again, that in his haste he has made a slight mistake. Moreover, I repeat that we do not know whether *Ḳode* really includes Cilicia, and in any case there is absolutely *no* ground for extending it beyond Syria. Should Hommel, however, object that Cilician slaves make *Ḳode* beer for the Egyptian king, I would remind him that, according to my deciphering, it is Cilicians, Hatio-Cilicians, from whom the Hittite inscriptions, *e.g.* of Hamāt in Syria, emanate. And even if—what we are not in a position to affirm absolutely—*Ḳode* did embrace Cilicia, then the king in the inscription of Bor would be, according to Hommel, king over Cilicia —as I maintain.

Hommel thinks (p. 461) my interpretation of the new seal or amulet published by Hayes Ward 'quite improbable and out of all analogy, nay altogether impossible and inconceivable.' I should like to know, Why? Still the interpretation may now be suffered in one point to drop. I have no intention of embarking upon long discussions, but simply state here, for behoof of those who take a special interest in these things, that the sign below the serpent, a pointed filled-up triangle, *may* at least equally well be the royal cone as the sign for 'servant,' which, where it *certainly* occurs, is not, according to my latest results, filled up. Further, the signification of the semicircle has been anew subjected by me to a very searching examination, with the result that it is quite certainly a synonym for 'king,' and used only to designate kings. Therefore I read provisionally: 'Of Cilicia (and) Arzauia (?) the . . . brave (?) prince, "Serpent," the king.' That is to say, I see provisionally in the serpent a personal name, as in the serpent upon the Seal 12 in Plate xvi f. in Wright's *Empire of the Hittites*—standing perhaps for the same person. Names of animals as personal names have been recognized by me also in Hamāt, Karkemish, Mar'ash, Bulgarmaden, Bor, and in the 'Bowl' inscription. As the modern Armenians are descendants of the Hittites, it is not an unimportant circumstance that amongst these very Armenians the names of animals recur with frequency as personal names.

The only additional remark I have to make on this point is that these new possibilities are of importance for the explanation of the Bilingual, and may at the same time contribute to modify still further Sayce's explanation, which has already undergone such radical modification. I note, with satisfaction, Hommel's (p. 461) acceptance now of my interpretation of the sign for 'lord,' as well as his assertion about the hand hieroglyphs which play so important a rôle in the inscriptions. Independently of me, of course (p. 462), although I maintained a similar position as long ago as 1894, he has meanwhile worked his way to the conclusion that the outstretched hand (with variants) is a hieroglyph for 'god.' As one sees, *La vérité est en marche.* I congratulate Professor Hommel on this further recognition of the truth as I have recognized it, and trust that, like myself, he too will soon have outgrown the childlike belief that it was simply from the love of variety that in certain quite definite instances the hand was portrayed in one position and in others in another. But I will refrain from passing judgment upon Hommel's variants. Possibly he is partially on the right track in what he says, for, in point of fact, a number of hand hieroglyphs which in my *Hittiter u. Armenier* I had still given under different numbers, coincide as variants of several primitive forms, No. 3 at Boghazkoi of the god hieroglyphs having probably to be identified with No. 6, No. 5 at Ordasu with No. 7, Nos. 8, 9, 10 all with No. 15,

and Nos. 12 and 13 both with the sign for 'great.' Certainly it is now permissible to ask what, then, Hommel makes now of the sign to which he, in conjunction with Sayce and in opposition to me, attributes the meaning of 'god'? Are there two ideograms for 'god'?

But all these things are trifles, on whose account it would not have been necessary for me to pay any attention to the 'Reply' of Hommel. There are two points, however, that unreservedly demand to be set right.

Hommel (p. 461) calls my criticism of the merits of Sayce (a criticism, by the way, called forth by himself) 'scandalous,' but he has not refuted it. I said (and say still) that Sayce, by means of two *false* conclusions, deduced from the small Bilingual — which, indeed, owing to its brevity, imposed relatively narrow limits on the sphere of interpretation—the *correct* interpretation of the sign for 'king,' and by means of another *false* conclusion arrived at the reading of the sign for *me*, without, however, proving it by a single further correct inference, and I added that I could not recognize in such discoveries 'the intuitive perception of genius.' This setting forth of the naked truth is to be called, then, 'scandalous.' Why, I cannot imagine. In that case one might surely well call it 'scandalous' also when Hommel, on behalf of his friend Sayce, brings forward my own demonstration and uses it against me. For it was not Sayce but *I* that formulated *one part* of my proof for the phonetic value of the sign *me* in the way that Hommel exhibits it in his plea for Sayce against me. But I added that such considerations did *not* suffice to establish the phonetic value as certain, and to-day I can add further that it is doubtful whether the sign in the Bilingual belongs to a name at all, in other words, the Bilingual perhaps supplies *no help* for the reading of the sign. It was my discovery of the group for *Karkemish* that first gave us certainty that the sign comprises at least an *m*! It is truly strange that Hommel, misconstruing the facts, shows such zeal for his friend Sayce, the very man who, as Hommel himself implicitly concedes, has done me an injustice in his criticism of my deciphering results. Is this Hommel's idea of the 'sine ira et studio' which he misses so sorely on my part?

But there is one point in which I must concede to Hommel (p. 461) that he is right as against me. It was scarcely justifiable to ignore Sayce's interpretation of the nominative sign. For, although the explanation was bound to occur to any one who gave so much as a glance at the inscriptions, although it did not absolutely hit the mark, although it was based merely upon an assertion instead of resting upon evidence, and although it remained unfruitful, not being justified by further correct inferences, still it was at least half correct, and therefore in a criticism of the merits of Sayce it ought to have found mention. I readily admit that I, like others, am not free from the disposition to underrate the merits of my predecessors, and that this disposition has played me a trick in the present instance. Whether, however, my criticism was on that account 'scandalous' let others judge. The question whether or to what extent I stand upon Sayce's shoulders I need not enter upon here. That also I leave to the objective judgment of the future. Hommel's disquisition on this subject is superfluous in a polemic against me, for I have not raised the question, but have simply aimed at defining with accuracy and precision the services rendered by Sayce—and nothing more.

In conclusion, however, I must protest against a method of procedure, for the characterizing of which words are completely wanting in my vocabulary. In my article in the June number I said that Hommel, in order to rescue the name *Tarkondemos* for the Bilingual, attributes to the cuneiform sign, which elsewhere is read *mu*, the phonetic value *dim*, which this sign has nowhere else. In this Hommel sees (p. 460) 'a melancholy evidence of my poverty as an Assyriologist,' and then proceeds further to offer his argument in favour of this phonetic value *dim*. He writes: 'Why, the very name of the sign *mu*, namely, *mu-ḫal-timmu*, shows that *mu* has also the values *ḫal* and *tim*; the word marked in the Great Syllabary (line 95) *u-dun* is written *u-mu* [read *u-dun*]; the value *lim*, "year," is a dialectic variant of *dim*; and, finally, the ideogram *mu*, when it signifies "bread," has the value *dim* (curtailed from *ḫadim*, *adim*), as is shown by *mu-ḫatimmu* (written *amelu*, "man," and *MU*) = "baker." . . .'! Although all this is, properly speaking, quite irrelevant to the main question whether the sign *MU* really *has* the phonetic value *dim* or not,—which I have denied, and which even Hommel does not assert,—I must use this example to illustrate Hommel's fashion of proof. What he brings forward against me in order to prove the theoretical existence of

something which is not present *in praxi*, consists in large measure of constructions and purely arbitrary assertions *ad hoc*. Because: (1) nothing can be inferred from the name *muḫaltimmu*, seeing that we do not know its nature. Hommel's explanation could be accepted only if on other grounds the readings *ḫal* and *tim* or *dim* for *MU* could be proved. 'Year' is certainly expressed by *MU*, but (2) *MU* in Assyrian does not signify *līmu*, and (3) *līmu* does not signify 'year' but 'eponymate'; (4) a (Sumerian) word *lim* is as yet unknown in the sense either of 'year' or 'eponymate,' and (5) a dialectic form *dim* for it is a pure coinage of Hommel's; (6) even if *MU* has the phonetic value of *dun* in Sumerian, yet *dun* is not *dim*, and (7) what *can* be read in *Sumerian* is not on that account *present* in *Assyrian*; (8) *MU* never signifies 'bread,' and (9) 'baker' is not *muḫatimmu* but *nuḫatimmu*. The innocent reader, unused to such methods, will imagine that I am treating him to a parcel of lies. Well, if he doubts my regard for the truth, I have to ask him to apply to unobjectionable Assyriologists, for instance to one whom Hommel himself rightly calls 'sober,' I mean Professor Zimmern. He will be able thus to assure himself that Hommel upon the basis of a multitude of airily constructed data sets up something as a fact which is purely a product of his own imagination, and because I quite rightly deny its reality, declares that my 'poverty as an Assyriologist' is demonstrated. Any one who has followed my previous explanations will perhaps understand why this reproach coming from this quarter does not move me, any more than the reproach that I betray my 'complete ignorance of the history of the Greek language' because I regard as ridiculous the affirming of a connexion between the Greek δράκων, δράκοντος, and the Hittite *Tarkhu*, etc. But I am anxious that one should learn here what means Hommel employs to put his opponent in the wrong.

I now address to Professor Hommel quite formally the request either to declare here in brief and straightforward fashion, and without any superfluous circumbendibus, that, as I asserted, the phonetic value *t(d)im* for the sign *MU* cannot be demonstrated from any Assyrian text, or else to adduce unambiguous evidence for it, and, as he cannot do this last, to confess that in an unheard of fashion he has groundlessly insulted me. I surely do not exaggerate my colleague's feeling of honour when I assume that he will accede to my proposal. But, in the interest of the readers as well as the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, I address to him the urgent request in future to adhere to the point so that this unedifying performance of ours may come to an end. We have already sufficiently abused their patience. Therefore in future let him give us fair and objective arguments *sine ira et studio*, such as he wishes I employed.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

NATURALISM AND AGNOSTICISM. By JAMES WARD, Sc.D., LL.D. (*A. & C. Black.* 8vo, Two Vols., pp. 322, 303. 18s. net.)

These are the Gifford Lectures of 1896 to 1898. You almost said we have had enough of Gifford Lectures. You may say so openly without offence. But they will come in spite of all saying, the lecturers being chosen and paid every year on the condition that they publish their lectures—every year to the end of time. If you meant that you have read enough, that is different. You may cease reading.

But then you will have read something that was not worth your reading and left unread something that was. You will have left unread Dr. Ward's Gifford Lectures, and we do not believe that anything stronger or truer has been called into being by Gifford's eccentric will.

They are philosophical chiefly. Or rather they deal with physical science where it touches philosophy and religion. Now it is an able and impartial account of where we are in the face of recent philosophy, on the basis of recent science, and in the light of eternal religion, that we most desire. For recent science has been looking round to gather its facts. It finds them fewer than was expected, but they are there. And accepting these facts, even the facts of evolution,

we must see how religion and philosophy can entertain them. Dr. Ward shows us.

His style is not merely popular, it is far better than that, it is accurate and convincing. His knowledge is beyond cavil. His conscience is in this work. The result is with the evangelic faith. What modifications of our statement of the faith he points to, do not concern us. But it does concern us that the very faith once delivered to the saints can accept all that is certain in physical science and go forward still, rejoicing as a strong man to run a race! Philosophy cannot do so. Dr. Ward has proved most unmistakably that Mr. Spencer's philosophy cannot do so. No system of philosophy that is not evangelical has yet been found to do so. For philosophy, we believe, was not *delivered* as our faith was.

The Cambridge 'Texts and Studies' are furnishing the student of the New Testament with material which he cannot find anywhere else, whether at home or abroad. We think we hold our own with continental scholars now in Old Testament study, that we do so and a little more in the study of the New Testament is certain. The two parts which complete the fifth volume of the 'Texts and Studies' are just issued (Cambridge: At the University Press). They are entitled *Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus* (8vo, pp. lxiv, 108, 5s. net), by H. S. Cronin, M.A., Dean of Trinity Hall, Cambridge; and *Clement of Alexandria's Biblical Text* (8vo, pp. xxii, 64, 4s. net), by P. Mordaunt Barnard, M.A., of Christ's College, Cambridge. To the latter Mr. F. C. Burkitt contributes a preface, in which he declares his readiness to accept the Western text as no whit inferior to that of Codex B. 'Let us trust the earliest texts we can get—Clement's among them—and see whether the result does not justify the venture.' And then he believes we should not be tied down to Βεεζεβούλ or Ἰωάνης; we should not have to omit 'without cause' in Mt 5^{22} or 'and the bride' in Mt 25^{1}; and we should find the synoptic problem lightened by leaving out Jn 12^{8} and Mt 21^{44}.

CHRISTIAN CHARACTER. By the Rev. T. B. Kilpatrick, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 298. 2s. 6d.)

There are those who value Dr. Kilpatrick's 'Primers' on *Christian Character* and on *Christian Conduct* beyond all they know of ethics. They at least will be glad to see them in this new dress, this finely printed and worthy volume. It is the day of morality—not without God. Let this morality be preached and prayed for and practised. For it is character that tells with God not less than with men.

THE STUDENT'S DEUTERONOMY. By R. B. Girdlestone, M.A. (*Eyre & Spottiswoode.* 8vo, pp. 92. 3s. 6d.)

To those who delight in the old paths of conservative scholarship this book will be at once welcome. To others its extreme conservatism will be an element to reckon with and discount. To all it will prove finally useful and stimulating. The new translation is on scientific lines—such lines as the Revisers of the New Testament did, the Revisers of the Old dared not, carry out. Its leading feature is that the English word chosen suggests what the Hebrew word is. For Mr. Girdlestone prefers a verbal translation to the literary variety of the Authorized Version. The marginal references are in keeping with this feature. They illustrate the language at least as often as the thought, but of course the two are usually combined. The notes are of no great consequence; and, as already hinted, the introduction has to be sifted and discounted; for no one stands just in this position in regard to Deuteronomy now. But all these things are in the line of the author's intention. It is not a scholar's and it is not a reader's, it is a student's book. Let the student search out the matter for himself, and his gain will be tenfold greater than if he were able and willing to swallow Mr. Girdlestone whole.

The Rev. J. A. Clapperton, M.A., has published at one time two books which deserve attention more than many. The one is *Pitfalls in Bible English* (Kelly, pp. 126, 1s. 6d.). It contains papers on the Old English words in the Authorized Version, a clever selection, illustrated by examples from contemporary writers. The other is *Ten to One* (Kelly, pp. 128, 1s. 6d.). This fanciful title is taken from Baxter's saying, 'Ten looks at Christ for One at Self.' The first paper is a sketch of Baxter's life with that as its central thought; the second a sketch of Suso's with its central

thought 'Forsaken'; and so through twenty-eight lives and twenty-eight mottoes.

SERMONS. By Charles Parsons Reichel, D.D., D.Lit. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. xcviii, 421. 6s.)

In all these sermons Bishop Reichel keeps it constantly in mind that it is possible to make the best of both worlds. And not only possible but necessary. For it is by the light of the world to come that we see to walk in this world, and it is by the deeds done in the body that we take our place in heaven or hell. There is, therefore, no compromise between religion and morality. If religious worldliness is mad, religious other-worldliness is fatuous. And as the sermons, so the man. There is a memoir from the hand of Dr. Reichel's son, the Principal of the University College of North Wales. That memoir reveals a great heart and mind, too great for any creed or organization to claim and confine. He belonged to the Church universal, and has taken his place now with those who have come out of the great tribulation.

THE BIBLE FOR HOME READING. By C. G. Montefiore. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. xxvii, 799. 5s. 6d. net.)

This is the second part of Mr. Montefiore's edition of the Old Testament for reading in Jewish homes. The first noticeable thing is the 'free and frank criticism of the biblical books as regards their dates, composition, or contents.' And if the Jewish parents can accept that, the rest is easy and admirable. Mr. Montefiore has not broken this volume down to the level of the young people. For its contents are the prophecy and poetry of Israel, with a chapter on the Maccabees, and that is best left to the parents to break down. But he has greatly assisted the parents by short summaries and accurate setting, occasionally also by original annotation.

Is infant baptism loss or gain? Together there come two books of the same size and earnestness; the one says loss, the other cries great gain. And then they argue the matter out. And for the most part they keep quite apart. What seems essential to the Rev. W. J. Lowe, M.A., of Londonderry, in his *Baptism: its Mode and Subjects* (Nisbet, pp. 197) is unimportant to the Rev. F. A. Jones in his book *The Gospel in Baptism* (Hopkins, pp. 128). And so they who believe that infant baptism is a blessing will see from Mr. Lowe's book how great a blessing it is; they who are convinced that infant baptism is a snare will be confirmed in their conviction by Mr. Jones. But that it is a matter upon which it is enough for every man to be fully persuaded in his own mind neither writer would for a moment allow.

IN THE HOUR OF SILENCE. By Alexander Smellie, M.A. (*Melrose.* Crown 8vo, pp. 397. 5s.)

It is a meditation for every day in the year, with an occasional devotional poem. All is original, and all of choicest quality. No word is lost, none is meaningless, none vague. The thought is never abstruse, but in touch with the simple realities of our spiritual life, yet it is always fresh. And, above all, the illustrations are chosen from unexpected places in literature, and usually surprise with their appropriateness. We have not had a Book of Daily Meditations so near to what it ought to be as this is, though many have tried to furnish one.

MODERN ROMANISM EXAMINED. By the Rev. H. W. Dearden, M.A. (*Nisbet.* Crown 8vo, pp. 412. 2s. 6d.)

The cause of all the crisis in the Church of England is the want of a doctrine of the Spirit. If there were a doctrine of the Spirit, then there would be no point in rising at the entrance of the priest: he is God's ambassador, but you do not worship the ambassador when the King is by. There would also be no need for the transubstantiation of the Supper: for if He is always present in Spirit with all grace and blessing in His gift, we should not feel the need of His bodily presence. But especially the doctrine of the Spirit tells us that where the Spirit is there is the true Church, and the Spirit is just where His fruits are seen—love, joy, peace, and all the rest. Then there would be no place for apostolic succession and the other concomitants of an outward unspiritual Church. So that is the root of all the differences between Romanism and Protestantism. It may not be said that the one has the Spirit, and the other has not. But the one has the doctrine of the Spirit and the other has not. Hence they start on opposite principles, and arrive at opposite results. Grant that Peter makes the Church and not the Spirit in Peter, and then all that Romanism is will follow.

Mr. Dearden does not express these things, but they seem to lie behind all he says. His object is to work out results. He shows what Romanism and Protestantism are in their historical manifestations. That they are not reconcilable without going back to the very first principles is manifest.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. By the Rev. James S. Dennis, D.D. (*Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier.* 8vo, pp. xxvi, 486. 10s. 6d.)

By their fruits ye shall know them—and the good as well as the bad, missions as well as rum-selling. And the missions have it. This is the second of three great volumes which are to be filled with the good—the social good—that has been wrought by Christian missions. The first purpose of missionary effort is the saving of the soul; but you cannot save the soul without beginning at once to purify the body, and sanctify the home, and sweeten the whole social atmosphere. Dr. Dennis knows about the saving of the soul, but begins after that. These are the *social* results of missions. The letterpress is plain, and does not awaken challenge; the illustrations are numerous, and answer it beforehand. How great might be the impetus to mission interest in our midst if these volumes were made the basis of sermons all over the land.

Two volumes have been added to Messrs. Oliphant's 'Famous Scots' Series—*Andrew Melville*, by William Morison, and *James Frederick Ferrier*, by E. S. Haldane. The biography of Andrew Melville has hit the mark most happily. Mr. Morison is in utmost sympathy, understands the man therefore, and without overloading his narrative, gives an impressive image of his greatness and endurance. Miss Haldane also has enthusiasm, and would reckon her hero no whit behind the great reformer. She has done well, and Ferrier was worthy. But he was not so great as Melville; we are able to *see* he was not so great.

Messrs. Rivingtons have published an edition of *The Book of Judges* (pp. 103, 1s. 6d), by Vice-Principal Stewart of Salisbury Theological College. It is not to be supposed that in his brief notes Mr. Stewart has any new light to throw on Judges after Moore's and other recent commentaries, but his book is worth issuing for its introduction alone. He discourses there on the Hebrew View of History, the Moral Difficulties of the Old Testament, the Land and its Inhabitants, the Times of the Judges, the Office of Judge, and the Chronology, in a quite masterly way within the space, making a distinct impression, and even conveying much information.

Messrs. Rivingtons have also published a small volume by Canon H. Percy Smith, M.A., of notes on some texts in the New Testament, which is called *Clariora Cariora.* Canon Smith has undoubtedly made some passages 'clearer' to the ordinary English reader, and no doubt then he is right in believing they will be 'dearer' to him.

Chenna and His Friends is the title of a new missionary book published by the Religious Tract Society (pp. 191). It is the story of a Hindu's work of grace and labour of love. It is told by Mr. Edwin Lewis, who was resident at Bellary from 1866 to 1898, and then died. His widow wrote a memoir of the author, from which we see what manner of entering in he had among these Bellary natives, and then she died also. The publishers have made the little book attractive by illustrations from photographs.

SACRED SONGS OF THE WORLD. Edited by H. C. Leonard, M.A. (*Elliot Stock.* Crown 8vo, pp. xx, 222. 5s.)

If to make the people's songs is better than to make their laws, their songs are a better expression of their character than their history. And so we have here the character, the religious character, of one hundred and twenty different peoples who speak one hundred and twenty different languages. Some of the songs are known, for their translators are men like Borrow and Longfellow. But some are unknown, and of these not a few are translated by Mr. Leonard himself. It is a manual of the religion of the world, and it is in the briefest, lightest form.

Mr. Belsey of the Sunday School Union has published *The Teacher's Red Book.* Without it is extremely like a manual of soldier's drill; within it is altogether so, the soldier being the Sunday-school scholar. And the drill includes seeing the scholar at home as well as attending to all the points of his instruction at school. It has two striking historical diagrams.

The Temptation of Christ.

By the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, B.A., B.D., Montrose.

V.

The conclusion of the previous inquiry is briefly as follows. Jesus found not only popular expectations, the authority of which He was not likely to admit, but even prophetic utterances indicating features in the Messianic kingdom inconsistent with, nay, contradictory to the moral and spiritual ideal which His own perfect filial consciousness demanded. The authority that He assigned to the Holy Scriptures as a revelation of God's mind and will made Him at first distrustful of this inward denying and opposing voice; yet certainly, although gradually, after a severe inward struggle, He became convinced that the incorporation of these features in His plan and purpose meant denial of, and disobedience to God revealing Himself directly and distinctly in His own consciousness. With the moral energy and intensity which afterwards showed itself in His passionate rebuke of Peter's remonstrance, 'Get thee behind Me, Satan,' when describing His experiences in the wilderness to His followers, He spoke of this opposition of His own convictions and the prophetic utterances as a conflict with Satan; but at the same time by His quotation of passages of Scripture in His rejection of each suggestion He indicated that He knew Himself to be in perfect harmony with the fundamental moral and spiritual principles of the older revelation, although forced to take up an attitude of independence towards some of its subordinate external elements.

1. If this account of the origin of the temptations in the consciousness of Jesus be accepted, the temptation in the wilderness becomes a proof, not of any moral weakness in Jesus, but of His matchless, unapproachable moral greatness. As often interpreted, the temptation in the wilderness appears morally improbable. A personality of the moral elevation and intensity which Jesus uniformly displayed seems to be, not by any metaphysical necessity, but by an ethical improbability, above and beyond any vulgar temptations of appetite, vanity, or ambition. It offends our sense of moral fitness to think of Him as feeling any of the common passions of human nature so keenly that they became temptations. No, His temptations must have come to Him on the moral heights in which He dwelt, must have been conformable to His lofty calling, and must have assumed forms so disguised, as to make a serious demand on His unerring moral insight, so persuasive as to put a severe test on His unfaltering moral courage. Is this requirement not fully met by the account of the temptation which has just been given? Not positively sinful passions, but a relatively inferior and inadequate ideal appealed to Him. He had the insight to discover the inferiority and inadequacy, the vigour to reject it as a temptation.

2. If it is said that this explanation takes its reality from the temptation, makes it impossible for us to say that He was 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,' the answer is not far to seek. It is surely a very shallow view of man's moral nature, that there must be identity of sins in order that there may be similarity of moral experience in temptation. The temptation to speak a false word is as really a temptation, involving the same moral struggle issuing in shameful defeat or thankful victory, to the man of honourable instincts, as the temptation to a debauch is to the drunkard. Moral experience has reality on the higher as well as the lower levels of action. It might with reason even be maintained that the reality of temptation corresponds with the elevation of personal character attained, that the saint's temptations are to him more real than the sinner's. Accordingly, we must deny the validity of this objection. Jesus' temptations were as real, made as urgent an appeal, involved as severe moral tension, and were rejected with as heroic struggle, as any temptations to which men may be exposed; even although He was not allured and enticed by the same sins as appeal to other men. His temptations were peculiar to Him, because His vocation was solitary, and His relation to God was unique. Ordinary temptations would not

have been real to Him, just because His moral nature was extraordinary.

3. But even against this position an objection may be urged. It may be said that, if Jesus stands thus quite alone, above and apart from all men, He cannot be a guide and an example. If seeking His guidance and following His example meant doing the very same deeds, speaking the very same words, and living the very same life, then certainly the objection would be valid. But to be like Jesus does not mean to be the same as Jesus; imitation does not mean identity. If it did, then every country and every age, nay, every man would need another Jesus as guide and example. But in Jesus universal and eternal humanity was incarnated, the divine ideal of man was realised, the prophecy of human history was fulfilled; and therefore in His life we must look for moral issues, not in their lower, but in their highest forms; His temptations must express the final conflict of good and evil in man, and represent the most difficult choice set before human liberty.

4. That the humanity in Jesus may be a reality, and not a semblance, there must be a choice for the exercise of liberty. Where there is choice, wrong and right must be alike possible. Although we follow a healthy moral impulse in seeking to show that the temptations to which Jesus was exposed were not open and gross, but subtle and disguised, although our loyalty to and reverence for Him compel us so to interpret the narrative of His temptation, as to bring into clearer light the unapproachable moral elevation of His personality, yet we must in the end without hesitation or reservation affirm that He was free to choose the wrong as well as the right. Without liberty no moral personality, no moral perfection, and therefore no ideal humanity realized. We need not ask what would have happened had Jesus chosen wrongly and not rightly. As empty and idle is this question as another, what would the world have been without sin? We cannot imagine what the world would have been without sin, and yet we do not affirm the necessity of sin. We cannot imagine what would have happened had Jesus chosen wrongly, but we must not therefore deny the possibility of the wrong choice. These speculative conjectures are not valid against moral certainties, that where there is manhood there must be freedom, and where there is freedom there must be choice of good or evil.

To appeal to the divinity of Jesus against this conclusion is to forsake the safe ground of history for the dangerous sea of speculation. Inferences from abstract definitions of divinity have no claim for a hearing, when we are dealing with facts. We have to ask ourselves not what our metaphysical notions of divinity imply, but what history tells us about the Word become flesh. If needful we must re-examine and readjust our metaphysical notions, that we may do justice to all the facts of the Incarnation. If our ideas of the divinity of Jesus make impossible or incredible His temptation as truly and fully a free choice of good or evil, so much the worse for our ideas; we must change them, however venerable their authority, or general their acceptance. And such a change will meet a truly religious demand. When God chooses to become man, it is impiety for us to doubt or to deny that He can become truly, fully, wholly man.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Oxford.

Three years ago a number of young German Orientalists founded a Society which had for its object the archæology of Western Asia and Egypt. They were all enthusiastic students of the monuments which modern excavation and research is so constantly bringing to light, and many of them had gained European reputations as decipherers and historians of the past. The *Transactions* of the 'West Asiatic Society' (*Vorderasiatische Gesellschaft*), which have already appeared, are full of original and important matter, and deserve more support from English archæologists and biblical critics than they have hitherto received. The Society is now supplementing its *Transactions* by a series of short and popular manuals on the ancient East, and the results of the most recent

researches in Oriental archæology. One of these has just been published by Dr. Winckler,[1] and gives a general review of what we have learned from the monuments about the ancient history of Western Asia.

It is needless to say that it is admirably done. Dr. Winckler is abreast of the latest discoveries, to which he has himself contributed no small share; he is not afraid to put forward new views, however daring and revolutionary, or to adopt the opinions of others when they seem to him to be right; and he never leaves us in doubt as to what he means. In a few short but luminous pages the whole history of the ancient East is sketched as we now know it to have been: the Sumerians and their Semitic successors, the Canaanites and Aramæans, the Arabs and Sabæans, the Hittites and their northern kinsmen, the proto-Armenians and Elamites,—all alike pass before our view. The account of the Hittites and their wanderings is especially noteworthy, and throws light on one of the dark corners of history, while the suggestion that the Leucosyri or 'White Syrians' of Strabo really denote the Lukki and Suri of the monuments is very attractive. So, too, is the ingenious identification of Bartatua of Askuza or Ashchenaz with the Scythian Protothyes of Herodotus, though it must be remembered that the name may be read Maztatua as well as Bartatua, and regarded as compounded with the name of the Persian god Mazda. On the other hand, Dr. Winckler seems to me to have proved that Mita, king of the Moschi, the antagonist of Sargon, is the same as the Phrygian Midas of Greek tradition. The identification is important in view of the Hittite monuments that exist near 'the city of Midas,' on the banks of the Sangarius—a name, by the way, which claims affinity to that of Sangara, the Hittite king of Carchemish.

On one or two points only should I be inclined to differ from Dr. Winckler. I believe that he antedates the predominance of the Semitic element in Babylonia, and I fail to see any support for the view that Anzan was the Media of the Greeks.

[1] *Die Völker Vorderasiens.* By Hugo Winckler. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899.

Requests and Replies.

Kindly inform me what are the best authorities for a study of the doctrine of the Trinity, especially in its Old Testament development.—G. J. R.

The doctrine of God as revealed in the O.T. may be studied in such introductions as those of Oehler and Schultz. When it appears, Dr. A. B. Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament* (in 'The International Theological Library') will probably be the most useful book of its kind in English; meanwhile, some help may be found in his article, 'God (in O.T.),' Hastings' *D.B.* vol. ii.

It is, of course, to the N.T. that the student will look for direct revelations as to the existence of distinctions in the Being of God. He should begin by reading afresh St. John's Gospel, with Westcott's commentary, and then proceed to the Pauline Epistles, where he will be aided by Lightfoot on Philippians and Colossians, and by Sanday and Headlam on Romans. From the N.T. he will go to the Greek and Latin writers of the fourth century, and read Athanasius on the Incarnation, Basil on the Holy Spirit, the theological orations of Gregory of Nazianzus, and part of the great work of Augustine on the Trinity. He may pursue the history of his subject in Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, or Ottley's *Doctrine of the Incarnation.* A more dogmatic treatment of the doctrine will be found in Canon Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, and Canon Gore's Bampton Lectures for 1891; its philosophical aspect is unfolded in Mr. Illingworth's *Personality, Human and Divine*, and *Divine Immanence.*

The literature is enormous. But the student who begins with the course which I have ventured to indicate will have laid a secure foundation for further study.

H. B. Swete.

Cambridge.

Will you furnish some explanation of the expression which is found in Am viii. 14: 'The manner of Beersheba liveth'?—E. St. J. W.

The whole verse according to the Authorized Version is, 'They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy God, O Dan, liveth; and, The manner of Beersheba liveth.' This translation comes from the Geneva Bible of 1560, which contains a marginal note: 'That is, the commune maner of worshiping and the service or religion there used.' The Hebrew word is thus taken in the sense of 'ritual,' 'cult,' 'manner of worship,' and that it is just possible to take it so is shown by the fact that elsewhere it is sometimes rendered 'manner' in the sense of custom. Thus Am 4^{10}: 'I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt.' But the ordinary meaning of the word (דֶּרֶךְ) is 'way,' 'road,' 'path,' and Driver prefers its usual translation, quoting from G. A. Smith and Doughty as to the Arabic custom of swearing by the way to a place. This is probably what is intended by the R.V. 'the way of Beersheba liveth.'

Editor.

Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.

By Professor Ed. König, Ph.D., D.D., Rostock.

The request of the Editor of The Expository Times that I would review Professor Margoliouth's pamphlet on *The Origin of the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus* reached me when I was engrossed with other work. I have readily turned from this, however, because it is important to arrive at a verdict on the question Margoliouth raises. I must add that I should gladly have devoted somewhat longer time to the examination of the subject, but the interest of the readers of The Expository Times has been so powerfully awakened by the July number (p. 433 f.), that I have determined to communicate in the August issue the results I have reached up till now. In what follows I will use for the Hebrew text published by Cowley and Neubauer the symbol H, and for the Greek and Syriac versions of Ecclus. the symbols G and S respectively.

An important principle to be observed in the examination of the question appears to me to be this, that in the first instance only the *text* of H furnishes the object of investigation. The marginal notes are a matter by themselves, and have only a secondary claim to be taken into account. It is confusing when at one time something from the text and at another a marginal note is brought under notice—a fault in form which Margoliouth has not entirely avoided (cf. p. 3 f., 6).

1. It is the natural course to look at the text first of all from the point of view of *quantity*. Margoliouth has not touched upon this at all, and all that Schechter (in Cowley and Neubauer, p. xii) says about it is that 'The Hebrew omits whole clauses which are to be found both in the Greek and in the Syriac. Certain clauses, again, are to be found in H which are wanting in both versions.' But even Schechter neither gives examples nor devotes any special discussion to the bearing of this quantitative relation of H, G, and S upon the originality of H.

Now, the *plus* of H, as compared with G and S, is made up, apart from particular words, of $39^{20b.\ 30c}$ 40^{9b} 41^{9a} $45^{7e.\ 25f}$ 46^{19e}. Have these passages the marks of secondary origin? In the first place, the question, 'Is there a number to his salvation'? (39^{20b}) was not so natural a one as to awaken the suspicion that it is an interpolation.[1] Again, is the remark that the wild beasts, etc. (39^{30ab}), were 'created for their use' (v.^{30c}) of such a kind that anyone would feel disposed to insert it? Further, 'pestilence and bloodshed, fever and drought,' as

[1] Regarding Smend's reading ('Das hebräische Fragment der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach,' in *Abhandl. d. Götting. Gesells. d. Wissensch.*, 1897) of 39^{20b} I reserve my judgment, but his view that תשועה is a substantive derived from שעה appears to me extremely uncertain.

Cowley and Neubauer rightly take to be the meaning[1] of 40^{9a}, is followed by the supplementary 'devastation and destruction, evil and death' ($v.^{9b}$). Is it more probable that H lengthened the list of evils than that G lessened the great number of closely allied terms? Precisely the same probability meets us in 41^{9}, where the synonymous forms of expression used in $v.^{9abd}$ might readily be contracted into a single *stichos*. The next *plus* of H, namely, 45^{7e} ('and clothed him with bells') probably owes its origin to the word וילבישהו ('and clothed him'), with which the following *stichos* ($v.^{8a}$) commences, having been twice written by a copyist, and then פעמונים ($v.^{9a}$) having been added as object.[2] On the other hand, it is quite unlikely that the clause 'who has crowned you with glory' (45^{25f}) is secondary, for it assigns the motive for the foregoing call to bless the Lord ($v.^{25e}$), and is presupposed by the following ויתן. This last word, moreover, is more probably original than the δῴη of G, for the Syriac, too, has a verb in the past ܝܗܒ, 'who gave,' or 'that he gave.' It is *possible*, however, that the words of 46^{19e}, 'also till the time,' etc., are a Hebraic augmentation. It *might* appear as if there was a *lacuna* between $v.^{19cd}$ and 'after his death' ($v.^{20a}$), and this may have been filled up by the words 'also till the time,' etc. (19^{e}).

The first *minus* of H, as compared with G and (or) S, concerns the words, 'None should say, What is this? wherefore is that? for everything will be sought out in his season' (39^{17ab}). But the first *stichos* ($v.^{17a}$) is wanting also in Codex Vaticanus of G, and both *stichoi* are absent from the Old Latin version. This appears to furnish a sufficiently plain indication that these clauses are a later expansion of the text.—The next *minus* of H meets us in the words, 'by His word takes place the rising of the sun, and by His word is its setting imposed upon it' (39^{21e}), which are found only in S. But who would not conclude that these words may readily have taken their rise as a detailed unfolding of the contents of the preceding general statement? Nor do I think it would be wrong to pass essentially the same judgment upon the origin of the τοὺς διαλογισμούς κ.τ.λ. of 40^{2ab}. Are these words not the interpretation of ἀσχολία and ζυγός of $v.^{1ab}$? And does not the same relation subsist between $v.^{11ab}$ and $v.^{12ab}$? There is of course also the possibility that in the textual history of H $v.^{12ab}$ may have got lost. In the one way or the other we may explain all the other instances of *minus* which H shows, as compared with G and S: 41^{22ab} (G), 42^{5b} (G) ^{18cd} (GS) ^{22ab} (GS), 43^{31ab} (G), $44^{11c.\ 12ab}$ (GS) ^{15a} (GS) ^{15b} (G), 45^{26bd} (GS), 46^{12a} (GS) ^{20d} (GS), 47^{16} (GS).

I cannot deny that the instances of *plus* on the part of H appear to me to constitute a feature which speaks in favour of the originality of this text. On the other hand, the instances of *plus* on the part of G (and S) may easily be traces of an *intra*-Jewish or even intra-Hellenistic development of Ecclesiasticus.

Before we proceed to look at the three leading forms of the text of Ecclus. from the qualitative point of view, it may be well to raise the *preliminary* question whether H, when examined by itself alone, bears unmistakable traces of *textual corruption*. These are to be found even in those passages of H on which there are no marginal notes, *i.e.* n $45^{9ff.}$, with the exception of $47^{8f.}$: לכם is written for לבן in 46^{8a} (? משואל for מושאל in $v.^{13b}$); משפט for מקדש in 47^{10d}; נברא for נבא in 48^{13b}; בנחשת for בנ' in $v.^{17c}$; probably נחל for נחלה in 49^{2a}; ביד י' for ביומי י' in $v.^{6c}$. My view of these passages agrees with that of Cowley and Neubauer, and their corrections of H, in all the passages cited, except the last, have been adopted unquestioningly even by Smend. Consequently, there can be no talk of doing injustice to the text of H, if in some other passage it is held that this text has suffered corruption.

2. In going on now to look at the three leading forms of the text of Ecclus. from the point of view of *quality*, it appears to me advisable to follow in the track of Professor Margoliouth, only I will take the passages with which he deals in the order in which they occur in the text.

(*a*) 40^{16} reads in H: כקרדמות על גפת נחל מפני כל מטר נדעכו. The question has already been asked by Cowley and Neubauer whether קרדמות is not corrupted from קרומיות, and they have rendered the latter word by '(reed-) stalks.' Further, they have, following the marginal note, replaced מפני by לפני, and also suggested that מטר is corrupted from חציר. As the לפני of the mar-

[1] When 'bloodshed' has been already mentioned, Smend's reading חֶרֶב, 'sword' (for חֹרֶב, 'drought') is less probable.

[2] I have noticed since that this same view has been expressed by, among others, Schlatter, *Das neugefundene hebr. Stück aes Sirach* (1897), p. 61.

ginal note may result from a comparison with G or S, so also may the חציר suggested by Cowley and Neubauer, and Margoliouth (p. 7 f.) regards it as beyond question that in v.[16a] G can have derived the word ἄχει only from a reading אחו in the *real* original. 'Clearly,' says Margoliouth, 'the Greek would not have used a Coptic word, had he not found it in his original; this *achei*, therefore, was used by Ben-Sira himself, who got it from Job (אחו [8[11b]]).' But it is not an incontrovertible fact that the translator could not have independently selected the word ἄχει, for there are both negative and positive elements in the Hellenistic Old Testament which point to an Egyptian residence on the part of some at least of its authors. Let one recall, on the one hand, the avoiding of the terms 'ass' and 'hare' (cf., on this point, my *Einleitung*, p. 106 f.), and, on the other hand, the choice of Egyptian terms: *e.g.*, κόνδυ (Gn 44[2]); ἴβις for ינשוף (Lv 11[17] || Dt 14[16]); ἀρτάβη for חֹמֶר (Is 5[10]); and this very word ἄχει is not only chosen in passages where אחו is found in the Hebrew (Gn 41[2. 18], Job 8[11b]), but is also used in Is 19[7] to translate ערות. Consequently, the same term, ἄχει, might be employed also in Ecclus 40[16], partly in order to call up a frequently occurring Egyptian plant,—such a regard to the Egyptian Jews is not, in view of the translator's prologue, improbable,—and partly because this passage appeared to contain a parallel to Job 8[12].

But even this last view is by no means beyond question, and I take the liberty of proposing the following interpretation of Ecclus. 40[15f.]. I accept Cowley and Neubauer's suggestion that קרדמות may be corrupted from קרומיות, but I find from Immanuel Löw's work, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen* (p. 202), that this word was used to designate poppy-heads (*Mohnköpfe*), which glow like torches. Thus, perhaps, may be explained the choice of the expression נדעכו, which means literally, 'they are extinguished.' On this basis, it appears to me, 40[15f.] of H may be rendered: 'The fruit (primarily in a personal sense) of violence (*abstractum pro concreto*) shall not remain free from evil consequences (experiences) [cf. for ינקה (Nu 5[19b], Jg 15[3a])], for the root of a godless one is on the tooth of a crag, is like poppy-heads on the bank (*or* by the side) of a brook, through every burst of rain they (both the root and especially the poppy-heads) are extinguished (*i.e.* destroyed).' It may be added that one might also render, 'which through every burst of rain are wont to be extinguished,' for *Sifa* is found in 39[30d] 40[11a] 42[1a] 43[30a] 48[5a].

(*b*) The fragments of the last word of 40[26d] (*sic*) have been restored by Cowley and Neubauer under the form מן[טמ], 'treasure,' and this corresponds very well with the parallel, מחסור, 'want,' of v.[26c]. But Smend offers as the conclusion of v.[26d] מעין, and Margoliouth (p. 7) remarks that this מעין is 'the equivalent for the Greek "help" and Syriac "helper." That word (unknown in this sense in Hebrew, Chaldee, or Syriac) is . . . given in Syro-Arabic glossaries.' But this remark is superfluous, and all that is built upon it collapses if the closing word of v.[26d] was מעון, in favour of which the ו read by Cowley and Neubauer may testify. By the way, in earlier periods of Hebrew writing ו and י were frequently of similar length (cf. Chwolson, *C. I. H.* p. 420; my *Einleitung*, pp. 74, 152). The word מעון is rendered in Ps 90[2] 91[9] by καταφυγή, 'refuge,' which has the same meaning as βοήθεια offered by G in Ecclus 40[26d].

(*c*) 41[12ab] reads, according to H, 'fear for (thy) name, for that will cling to thee more than thousand treasures of wisdom.' S has 'treasures of wickedness,' and G 'treasures of gold' (χρυσίου). Margoliouth (p. 14) argues in favour of הן as the original reading. This, he thinks, is supported directly by G, and indirectly by S, because הן could be pronounced like אן. Margoliouth holds, further, that אן may actually have been the original expression in 41[12b]. Now, as this word אן is 'often' reproduced in Syriac by ܥܲܒ̰ܵܐ *'ettâ* (Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* p. 255[a], 'fraus, dolus'), Margoliouth proceeds to argue that the Syriac word happening in 41[12b] to be preceded by the genitive exponent ד, the '*re*-translator' took the consonants ܕܥܒ̰ܵܐ to be *one* word, and derived this from ܝܕܥ ('he knew'). This word ܕܥܒ̰ܵܐ ('science'), which has no existence in Syriac, he is supposed to have attributed to the Syriac text of 41[12b] and reproduced 'science,' not by דעת, but by חכמה, 'wisdom.'

It will be admitted, we presume, that the way in which this last term (חכמה) in 41[12b] is supposed to have been arrived at is far from a simple one, and if the supposed re-translator had so slight an acquaintance with Syriac, how could he have translated from the Syriac Ecclesiasticus? Hence I propose the following solution of the difficulty:—I should favour חֲרוּץ (which in all the six passages

[Zec 9^3, Ps 68^{14}, Pr 3^{14} $8^{10.\ 19}$ 16^{16}] where it occurs is rendered by χρυσίον), or חמדה 'desire' (the marginal reading), as the original word, were I not restrained by the following circumstance. Margoliouth, who so vigorously combats the claim of חכמה, 'wisdom,' to be the original conclusion of 41^{12b}, has not observed the חכמה טמונה, 'buried wisdom,' of v.^{14b}, which certainly is a backward allusion to v.^{12b}. Hence I am disposed to give the preference to חכמה, 'wisdom,' as the term with which v.^{12b} originally closed. The meaning intended by the statement in v.^{12ab} that a good name is of more value than thousand treasures of wisdom was this, that *intellectual* culture and the fame of the scholar are not to be regarded as the highest possessions. The sentiment was too fine for some readers, who began to question whether it was correctly expressed. Hence came the reading in one MS., חמדה, 'desire,' which might be converted by the Greek translator into 'gold,' the concrete object of widely diffused desire, while the other reading of H, namely, חכמה, 'wisdom,' 'prudence,' might be restricted by S, in the interest of the context, to the more special *'ettâ*, 'cunning,' 'deceit.'

(*d*) In 42^{11e} H says, 'the place where she (thy daughter) tarrieth, let it be no lattice.' The meaning appears to me to be that a young maiden is not to choose a window-niche for her favourite post. But in S the sentence runs, 'in the place where she dwells let her not go out,' while in G this *stichos* is wanting. Margoliouth (p. 15) will have it that the Syriac verb *shebaḳ*, 'to abandon,' was misunderstood and falsely combined with the 'familiar Arabic *shubbak*' (Freytag, *Lex. Arab.*: *shibâkun*, fenestrae reticulatae). This happened, although the Syriac verb was pronounced with the emphatic *ḳ* (ḳoph) and the Arabic substantive with the ordinary *k* (kaph)? Is it not more likely that the counsel given by H has been toned down by the Syriac translator? This conclusion is further recommended by other two circumstances. In the first place, the Syriac form of 42^{11e} contains a contradiction within itself. For where else could she go out (*i.e.* leave her dwelling) except 'in the place where she dwells'? The words just quoted suit only the Hebrew form of this *stichos*, and were retained, although the concluding portion had a milder character given to it. Secondly, our conclusion is supported by the circumstance that the following clause (v.^{11f}) cannot have been translated from the Syriac. For S says, 'And among the houses let her not be going about,' but H has, 'Nor let it (the place where she tarries) be a house (*or* chamber) looking upon the entrance round about.' Margoliouth (p. 16) maintains that the observance of this rule is either quite impossible, or at least that it would impose upon the father to whom a daughter is born, the necessity of erecting a wall round his house. But this difficulty need not be found. The text may presuppose that there are several rooms in a house, and the counsel of H may be to the effect that for a young maiden a room should not be chosen which commands a view on all sides.

(*e*) In 43^{4c} H has the words לשאון מאור תגמר נושבת, which Margoliouth (p. 7) renders, 'blowing out a tongue of light which blazes.' He thus takes נושבת to be the active participle of נ׳שב. But, in the first place, this occurs in the O.T. (Is 40^7) only as an intransitive verb, whereas the active sense is expressed by the hiph'il, הִשִּׁיב, and so also in Ecclus 43^{20a}. Again, the context supplies no feminine substantive to which the feminine participle נושבת could refer. Hence this participle must be regarded as the passive form ('the inhabited [country]') and as the object of תגמר. The latter word may signify 'she brings to an end,' for גמר might have the sense of 'finish' (*vollenden*) in a negative sense as well, just as the Aramaic גְּמַר actually signifies 'end,' 'destroy' ('beendigen, vernichten' — Dalman *Aram.-neuheb. Wörterb.*, 1897, p. 77^b). Consequently, an appeal to the Arabic *ġamara* ('dedit prunam ignis') is out of place. Finally, it is by no means beyond doubt that the א of לשאון is due to imitation of the Arabic لسان. If the 're-translator' had meant to render in Hebrew, he could not have written the words after the manner of Arabic. May not the א have been due to a careless copyist who was thinking of שׁאון, 'ruin,' 'destruction' (Jer 46^{17}, Ps 40^3)?

(*f*) In 43^{8d} the moon is described as מְרַצֶּפֶת וג׳, 'paving the firmament with (40^{28a}) her shining,' the meaning of which has been admirably illustrated by Canon Driver through a quotation from *Romeo and Juliet* (see Cowley and Neubauer, p. xxxv). I confess that the word 'paving' or 'embroidering' (in connexion with the stars) strikes me as more poetical, when spoken of the moon, than 'illuminating.' There is something of pleonasm in 'illuminating the firmament with her light.'

Yet Margoliouth (p. 6) prefers to derive מרצף 'from the Arabic'—he must be thinking of רַצָּף, *radfun*, and the denominative verb رضف 'durch einen Glühstein erwärmen,'— and to render *m'raṣṣef*, as he himself (p. 7) transcribes the word, by 'illuminating.' He does this, because G reads *ἐν στερεώματι οὐρανοῦ ἐκλάμπων*, and S agrees. But, with the confident expectation of an answer in the negative, I would put these two questions: Does the form of the sentence in G and S look like the poetical original? Is there any probability that a translator should have given to the words of G and S, both of which have the expression '*in* the firmament,' the form which we find in H, where 'firmament' forms the object? No, on the other hand, G and S present a simplified form of the words, and it is not the *text* of H which rests on a comparison with G or S, or both. On the marginal note, which is found at 43^{8d}, see below.

(*g*) In 43^{9a} both G and S have the plural, 'stars' (*ἄστρων*, and ܟܘܟܒܐ with the two points of *Ribbûi*). Margoliouth (p. 17, where he incorrectly cites the passage as 44^{9}) thinks that the 're-translator' overlooked the plural points in the Syriac. But was the plural, 'stars,' overlooked also in the Persian version to which, according to Margoliouth, the re-translator owed his knowledge of G? In any case he must have found the singular, 'star,' in 'both his sources' (p. 17), and regarded it as a possible reading. And is it wholly improbable that the moon should be called 'glory of a star,' *i.e.* a splendid specimen of a star? Might it not readily happen that this *genetivus appositionis* passed into a *genetivus partitivus*?

(*h*) In 43^{20}, too, Margoliouth finds a recurrence of 'the phenomenon: the Greek is sound sense, the "Original Hebrew" absurd' (p. 10). Let us test this instance. H says, 'The cold of the north wind (Pr 25^{13a}) He (the so-called logical subject of the context, *i.e.* God) causeth to blow, and like rottenness He makes contracted (consistent, or the like) His spring,' *i.e.* the spring which God Himself has made, and destined to bubble up with living water and *not* to be congealed. God, then, is said to abolish the original nature of the springs just as rottenness changes the original character of any object. It is, therefore, not beyond question that the marginal reading, which replaces מקורו 'His spring,' by מקוה '(each) collection of water' (cf. Gn 1^{10}), is to be preferred. It is *not* probable, because the standing waters are mentioned in $v.^{20cd}$. But even if מקוה in $v.^{20b}$ were to be preferred, yet the language of H would not be 'absurd.' For רקב, 'rottenness,' at which Margoliouth takes most offence, might assume the more general sense of 'corrupt condition' (*Verdorbenheit*), and be transferred to the *curdling* of milk and other liquids. And once more the question arises: Which is more likely, that the words of G, 'a cold north wind shall blow and crystal shall be congealed from water,' originated from H, or that the reverse process took place? To me the answer does not appear to be doubtful, when I observe the variety of probable references which might be discovered in the words of H.

(*i*) In 43^{24a} G has 'they that sail on the sea tell of its danger,' whereas H offers the text 'they that go down to the sea tell of its end' (*or* totality, cf. קצה—Gn 47^{2}, Nu 22^{41}, Is 56^{11}, Ezk 33^{2}). This need not be understood in an absolutely affirmative sense, as if it were meant that these men actually relate that they have reached the end of the sea or explored the whole of it, although even this might happen with a boasting disposition. Nor is the view that $v.^{24a}$ is intended as a question ('May they that,' etc.?) quite impossible. Yet, without taking into account any of these possibilities, Margoliouth (p. 8) finds 'a correct sentiment in the translation, an absurdity in the "original."' But, if the re-translator had found the concept 'danger' in G, would he have reproduced it by קצה, 'end,' 'limit,' 'totality'? It is more natural to assume that the difficult concept was replaced by a more usual one.

(*k*) The words of 46^{20b}, 'and he declared to the king his ways,' *i.e.* his fortune (cf. Ps $10^{5a}37^{5a}$), are found also in S, only that the plural, 'his ways,' is replaced by the singular, and, seeing that the fortune whose announcement is attributed in $v.^{20b}$ to Samuel, was in reality the *end* of Saul, is it incredible that this concept should have been expressed by G in the form *τὴν τελευτὴν αὐτοῦ*? Margoliouth (p. 13 f.) makes a threefold assumption: (*α*) the original was אחריתו, 'his end'; (*β*) this word was *mis*read by S as ארחתיו, and this plural was translated by him as a singular; (*γ*) the singular of S ('his way') was changed by the Hebrew re-translator into the plural ('his ways.') These three assumptions appear to me to form a triple alliance that will not stand.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS XXVIII. 16, 17.

'And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not. And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.'

EXPOSITION.

'Surely the Lord is in this place.'—Jacob was not unaware of the omnipresence of the Deity; what astonished him was that Jehovah should thus reveal Himself far away from the shrines where He was worshipped. Rebekah had gone to one of these to inquire of Jehovah (chap. 25^{22}), and probably to a shrine in the very neighbourhood of the place where Jacob was sleeping. But first Abraham and then Isaac had for so long made Beersheba their home, that Jacob probably knew little about the sanctity of the spot, and felt himself far away from all the religious associations of his youth, and from that 'presence of Jehovah' which in antediluvian times had also been supposed to be confined to certain localities (chap. 4^{6}).—PAYNE SMITH.

THIS was, most probably, the place later distinguished by the presence of the holy tabernacle, where sacrifices were offered and vows were fulfilled. It cannot therefore surprise us that this spot was considered as pre-eminently holy. For although the glory of God pervades the universe, so that not even the heaven of heavens can hold it, some localities were deemed as His special abodes, where men assemble, pour out their hearts, and obtain peace; for as long as religion is connected with a visible worship it will be impossible for the human mind to divest itself of the notion that there are certain places more properly hallowed by the Divine presence.—KALISCH.

'I knew it not.'—He knew it not; but he knows it now—knows it in the access of strength, knows it in the promise of hope, knows it in the celestial voice and the ineffable light. All the common interests of life—the avocations, the amusements, the cares, the hopes, the friendships, the conflicts—all are invested with a dignity and an awe unsuspected before. Reverence is henceforth the ruling spirit of his life. This monotonous round of commonplace toils and commonplace pleasures is none other than the house of God. This barren stony thoroughfare of life is the very portal of heaven.—LIGHTFOOT.

'How dreadful is this place.'—The manifestation of God must always inspire awe and dread, but not fear: for where He reveals Himself, there is the 'gate of heaven'—the appointed entrance for prayer now, and for admission to the glorified life hereafter.—PAYNE SMITH.

'The house of God.'—Peculiarly God's dwelling-place, where Jacob had come into more direct contact with God than anywhere else.—DODS.

'The gate of heaven.'—The 'gate of heaven' seems to stand in contradistinction to 'house of God'; and as the latter refers to the place where Jacob had rested, the former alludes to the entrance of heaven, through which the angels came down upon the earth, and at which the Lord was standing. 'Gate of heaven' is, therefore, not synonymous with 'heavenly abode,' or with 'house of God'; though the word *gate* is sometimes used for the whole dwelling or house.—KALISCH.

THE entrance to the spiritual world; which shows that he did not consider God to be confined to the spot where he had slept, but that somehow at this spot there was a way of access to God. In the face of the promise of v.[15], 'I am with thee in all places whither thou goest,' it is impossible that Jacob can have thought of God as confined to one spot.—DODS.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

The Lord is in this Place.

By the Rev. S. A. Brooke, M.A.

Jacob's first impression was surprise, his second fear, his third the sense of a spiritual presence.

1. *Surprise.*—Unlike the stirring life of Esau, his had been commonplace and monotonous. Long-continued ease at home leads a man to rest on the outward and visible. He is apt to become selfish; trifles become great duties, and the world without and his duty to it a mere dream. Now Jacob is torn from the comfortable and customary and finds himself in a new world, the spiritual, where he meets God. So we live for years the life of custom and commonplace, thinking the chatter of our home the murmur of the world, absorbed in its interests, when, suddenly, we are awakened. It may be love, or the death of love, the sense of sin or a nation's agony for freedom that arouses us. We start with surprise and awaking cry, 'What is this? Surely God is here, and I knew it not.' Until we have this vision we are not men, and he who has seen it is never the same again. Are you still living the old life, in the world and not above it, *unsurprised*? Then ask with prayer what your ignorance means and wring from God the answer.

2. *Fear.*—It was inherent in Jacob's character. It spoilt him in his early days, but he had manly

stuff in him, and he subdued it, and afterwards it was lifted into veneration of God. His present fear was caused partly by the sense of sin, partly by realizing the presence of the Invisible. No one who does not know God can feel himself touched by God without fear. If he only feels Him as a dreadful power the result will be superstition, but if he knows and loves Him the result is veneration. From that hour the love that casts out fear began to stir in Jacob's heart. He began to realize not an angry Being, but One who loved him and would care for him. As he grew, selfishness died; only love and awe and trust were left. Then the degrading fear departed, for perfect reverence for the Highest frees a man from the fear of anything lower. To that Jacob attained at last when he stood with dignity before Pharaoh, unashamed before kings because he reverenced the highest King. His weak spirit had grown into strength.

3. *The Sense of God's Presence.*—He had thought of God as dwelling in heaven. He found Him in Bethel also. As life went on he found other places full of God. At last he reached a great conclusion—God was everywhere. We go farther and find God in all the universe—in all thought, in man, in nature, in history; not only in the miraculous, or in great events, but in the common life of common men. And the thought makes life beautiful. David on the hills of Bethlehem, Paul and Silas in the dungeon, the martyrs in the arena saw the vision of Jacob, and it was to them the house of God, the gate of heaven. But the thought is solemn also, that we are in God's house, that every deed is done in His sight, every word is heard, every thought known to Him. Find your way to heaven in your daily work. Refuse its duties, neglect its opportunities, and it is to you the gate of hell, but God's presence makes everything divine, and out of the most commonplace life will rise steps to the Father's house.

II.

The Gate of Heaven.

By the Rev. Thomas Green, M.A.

A gate has two uses—for admission and exclusion. When it is open it furthers progress, when shut it prevents it.

1. The expression 'gate of heaven' implies a place not walled round in such a way that there is no escape for those within nor entrance for those without. Heaven may be entered by those who will, but the gate may also be closed for ever. Some men make out that the gate can never be shut, that all go to heaven, but indiscriminate admission is not God's intention for human souls, He keeps the right to lock out and lock in.

2. What passes through this gate? (1) Christ came—not only angels as in Jacob's vision, but the Son of God—to take our nature and redeem us. Again He passed back in triumph when He had finished His work. (2) Prayer passes the gate, for it is open to the prayers of the humble and contrite heart. (3) Christ opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers. Our loved ones have gone through the gate. We see this side of it, and it looks dark, but on the other side the light of God shines for ever. The angels came and returned; the Lord Jesus came and returned, but He left us His promise, 'Lo! I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.' He is with us still, or we should be hopeless of reaching the other side of the gate.

We cannot tell how soon we may be called upon to pass through the gate, but we must desire that when it is finally closed, we may be among those to whom an 'entrance is ministered abundantly.'

Illustrations.

In proportion as we gain the sense of God's presence we are safe in the very tumult of life, in the very thick of the strife of tongues. For this presence protects our own individuality; it protects us so that we do not lose ourselves, and become, as we are often apt to do, almost a mechanical part of the world and the society in which we live; sinking into a routine in which we lose more and more the sense of responsibility. We certainly need this, a clear and ever-deepening sense of our own separate and solitary individuality, with all its consciousness of personal responsibility and the dignity of personal life. And the first thing that the realization of God's Presence does for any man is to deepen this sense of his own personality and responsibility. He lives in a Presence which is stronger than all the influences round him; that Presence isolates him, frees him from the tyranny of the standards and judgments of the little coteries which make his world, and gives him new standards to judge himself by.—B. W. Maturin.

In one of his poems Lowell tells the story of an ancient prophet who made a pilgrimage far into the wilderness until he reached the holy hill Mount Sinai. He had been

conscious that for some reason God's Presence had deserted him, and he had set out for the sacred mountain, confident that there if anywhere, he should find it again. And so he stood on the hillside, and prayed to God to give him a sign. He bowed his head, and waited for the answer to his prayer. He expected something wonderful, perhaps a loud peal of thunder. He heard nothing; not even a breath of wind stirred the air. But suddenly, while his eyes were cast on the ground at his feet, the tuft of moss before him burst open, and a little violet sprang through. In a moment it flashed upon him how blind he had been; he remembered that just before he left home his little daughter had come running to him, to give him a nosegay of precisely the same flowers. These flowers grew at his own door; he saw them every day; he had no need to come so far for them. He had been careless of the little things which, put together, made up the sum of his life from day to day, and he was now taught that these should have been his first care.—W. Moody.

Look into your own soul, and what do you find there? Yes, ye yourselves are the temple of the living God. He is there—there, whether you will or not. Through your reason, through your conscience, through your remorses and regrets, through your capacity of amendment, through your aspirations and ideals, He speaks to you. You are His coinage. His image and superscription are stamped upon you. Aye, and He has also re-stamped you, re-created you, in Christ Jesus by the earnest of His Spirit. If it be true of your body that it is fearfully and wonderfully made, is it not far more true of your soul? Henceforward you will regard yourself with awe and reverence as a sanctuary of the Eternal Goodness. You will not, you dare not, profane this sanctuary. Here is the true self-respect—nay, not self-respect, for self is abased, self is overawed, self veils the face and falls prostrate in the presence of Infinite Wisdom and Purity and Love thus revealed. Surely, surely the Lord was in this place—in this poor, self-seeking, restless, rebellious soul of mine, and I thought it a common thing, I went on my way heedless, I followed my own devices and desires, I knew it not.—J. B. Lightfoot.

God is never so far off as even to be near:—
He is within! Our spirit is the home He holds most dear.
To think of Him as by our side is almost as untrue,
As to remove His throne beyond those skies of starry blue,
So all the while I thought myself homeless, forlorn, and weary,
Missing my joy, I walked the earth—myself God's sanctuary.—Faber.

There is a saying of Hazlitt's, bold, and at first seeming wondrous true: 'In the days of Jacob there was a ladder between heaven and earth; but now the heavens have gone farther off, and become astronomical.'—G. Dawson.

Thou hast been with me in the dark and cold,
And all the night I thought I was alone;
The chariots of Thy glory round me rolled,
On me attending, yet by me unknown.

. . . . . .

Why did I murmur underneath the night,
When night was spanned by golden steps to Thee?
Why did I cry disconsolate for light,
When all Thy stars were bending over me?

The darkness of my night has been Thy day;
My stony pillow was Thy ladder's rest;
And all Thine angels watched my couch of clay
To bless the soul, unconscious it was blest.

I'll build a monument to that dead pain,
In whose sore anguish conscious life was given;
And write on loss the record of the gain,
'This was the house of God, the gate of heaven.'—

G. Matheson.

Sermons for Reference.

Candlish (R. S.), Discourses in Genesis, ii. 10.
Davies (D.), Talks with Men, Women and Children, ii. 411.
Halsey (J.), Beauty of the Lord, 69.
Hook (W. F.), Sermons on Various Subjects, 152.
Krause (W. H.), Sermons preached in Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, ii. 108.
Laing (F. A.), Simple Bible Lessons for Little Children, 40.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Cambridge Sermons, 300.
Little (H. W.), Arrows for King's Archers, No. 32.
Mozley (J. B.), Parochial and Occasional Sermons, 28.
Parker (J.), Studies in Texts, iii. 177.
Rankin (J.), Character Studies in the Old Testament, 30.
Sadler (M. F.), Sermon Outlines, 105.
Sampson (E. F.), Christ Church Sermons, 44.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. vii., No. 401.
Symington (A. M.), Apostles of our Lord, 171.
Thomson (W.), Life in the Light of God's Word, 94.
Vaughan (J.), Fifty Sermons, ix. 81.
Wilberforce (S.), Sermons, 66.

Contributions and Comments.

Was Tyre taken by Nebuchadrezzar?

In response to an invitation addressed to me on behalf of the Editor, I offer the following observations on the above question, which has been recently debated by Mr. Selbie and Professor Sayce in The Expository Times (May, June, July 1899).

Nebuchadrezzar came to the throne in 605 B.C.; the first official year of his reign is, in accordance with Babylonian usage, 604. It is generally held (so *e.g.* Ed. Meyer and also Professor Sayce) that the siege of Tyre took place 585–573 B.C. With this may be compared Ezk 26 (eleventh year of Zedekiah and of the First Captivity = nineteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar; cf. also the Table in my *Gesch. Bab. u. Assyr.*, p. 753). Shortly thereafter Ezekiel speaks ($29^{17f.}$; twenty-seventh year of the Captivity = thirty-fifth year of Nebuch.) of Nebuch. having received 'no wages,' neither he nor his army, from Tyre, 'for the service that he had served against it.' In 1888, in my *Gesch. Bab. u. Assyr.*(p. 760), I interpreted this, with many others, to mean that Nebuch. merely blockaded Tyre and finally, indeed, brought it again under tribute, but did not actually capture it. On the other hand, Pietschmann, in his *Gesch. der Phönizier* (1889), takes the course of events to have been that Ithobaal II., who was king of Tyre all through the siege, finally surrendered to the Babylonians, 'compelled, no doubt, simply by the straits to which his subjects were reduced through being cut off from the mainland and through the cessation of all industry.' He adds, however, with citation of Ezk $29^{17f.}$, 'carried by storm, plundered, destroyed the city was not; Ithobaal's family had to remove to Babylon in order that, in the event of Baal II., with whom Nebuch. invested Tyre, proving recalcitrant, the Babylonians might have at their disposal pretenders to the crown.'

I must confess that such a view as this last may likewise claim to be fully justified. 'Tyre could not be taken' (see my art. Babylonia in *Dictionary of the Bible*, i. 229^{a}) is a statement which is still correct, and yet it would appear that in the end the city elected voluntarily to surrender to the Babylonian king (the terms being that they would accept of a new king, Baal, at the hands of the Babylonians, and give up Ithobaal, in return for immunity from the plunder and destruction of their city). In this way Professor Sayce likewise is correct in his statement that 'in 573 B.C. it passed, with its fleet, into Nebuchadrezzar's hands.' The new king, Baal, was thus nothing but a creature of Nebuchadrezzar's, and so it is quite intelligible how, in the contract tablet published by Mr. Pinches, from the fortieth year (565 B.C.) of Nebuchadrezzar, the latter is indeed called 'king of Babel,' but Tyre is given ['Tyre, 22 Tammuz, fortieth year of Nebuch., king of Babel'] as the place where the deed was drawn up, although the transaction[1] concerned the city of Kidish, which was under a Babylonian governor.

When Nebuchadrezzar died in the year 562, complications at once began in Tyre. From 562 till 556 (*i.e.* till the accession of Nabonidus) Tyre was ruled not by kings but, with a single brief exception (Balatoros, 1 year), by *Suffetes* (שפטים, 'judges'), until finally a party came to the front which sent to Babylon for a new regular king, Merbaal, who reigned for four years, until he was displaced (552) by his brother, Hiram III., who reigned till 532. Nothing could indicate more clearly than these circumstances that the Tyrians only waited for the death of their conqueror, Nebuchadrezzar, to make themselves once more independent of Babylon.

From all this the most probable reply to the question with which we started is, that Tyre could not be *taken* by Nebuchadrezzar, but that it passed, notwithstanding, after a fruitless blockade of thirteen years, into the hands of the Babylonian monarch.

Fritz Hommel.

Munich.

Critical Gleanings from 1 Samuel.

The publication of Professor H. P. Smith's very careful commentary on the First Book of Samuel may perhaps give an additional interest to the consideration here attempted of some grave critical problems. It is important to take a fresh step forward in the criticism of the text of the historical

[1] Milki-idri, governor of Kidish, sells cows to one Ablâ, son of Nadinachi, son of a sun-priest (? Baal-priest).

as well as the poetical and the prophetical books. Bold criticism is often called arbitrary criticism, but this may be a proof of unacquaintance with comparatively new methods. For other corrections of the text of Samuel I may refer to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, December 1897, and February and March 1899.

1 S $6^{8.11.15}$.—בָּאַרְנּוֹ, הָאַרְנּוֹ, 'in the coffer,' 'the coffer' (R.V.). Professor H. P. Smith remarks that 'the word translated "box" occurs only in this account' (*Samuel*, p. 44), and makes no attempt to throw any fresh light on the mysterious word (ארנז). Certainly the etymologies of Lagarde and Klostermann are too far-fetched. And though *θέμα* represents מערכה in Lv 24^{6} and elsewhere, and 'in a row' would give a fair sense, yet 'the evidence is not sufficient to assure us of a variant reading here.' In fact, the rendering in $\mathfrak{G}^{B}$ (*ἐν θέματι* [*βερεχθαν*]) can be readily explained without supposing the reading במערכת. *θέμα* probably = *θῆμα* = *θήκη*, 'box'; $\mathfrak{G}$ guesses apparently at the meaning of ארנז. The corruption then must be very old. But it can be healed. The ז sprang out of a 'final *nūn*' attached, as a correction, to an ordinary *nūn*; thus ארנן became ארנז. The 'coffer' was not really distinguished by its name from the ark.

1 S 16^{12}.—David was 'ruddy, and withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to.' So A.V.; R.V. agrees except in the last word: 'to' becomes 'upon.' But there is a difficulty in עִם, rendered 'withal.' H. P. Smith sees this, and, like Budde, adopts Grätz's and Krenkel's correction, עֶלֶם, 'a young man.' But we require a compound expression, parallel to יְפֵה עֵינַיִם and טוֹב רֹאִי. I cannot feel much doubt in preferring עֵצֶם both to עֶלֶם and to Klostermann's שֵׂעָר. Cf. La 4^{7}, אָדְמוּ עֶצֶם, 'they were ruddy in body' (E.V.). David, too, was 'ruddy (reddish-brown) in body.' To alter עֶצֶם into מֵעֲצֵי, 'than branches (of coral)' seems undesirable.

1 S 17^{1}.—באפס דמים, 'in Ephes-Dammim.' Our commentator well remarks that 'as the situation is sufficiently described by the names of Shocoh and Azekah, this redundant statement is suspicious.' In the critical note he mentions Lagarde's correction בספר המים, 'on the brink of the waters,' but rightly expresses a doubt 'whether there was water enough in the wady to justify the language.' I should say myself that אפס is certainly a corruption of עֵמֶק, דמים is not so transparent. Two views have occurred to me. (1) Read בְּעֵמֶק רְפָאִים, 'in the valley of Rephaim,'—this was possibly the true scene of the encounter with Goliath. פַּס־דַּמִּים in 1 Ch 11^{13} has already been corrected thus by Marquart. (2) Read בְּעֵמֶק אֲדֻמִּים, 'in the valley of the red-brown (lands).' Miller says: 'Large patches of it (the ploughed land in the valley) were of a deep red colour, exceptional and therefore remarkable in Palestine' (*The Least of all Lands*, p. 125). Cf. מַעֲלֵה אֲדֻמִּים, 'the ascent of the red-brown hills,' Jos 15^{7} (see Dillmann's note). Little depends on the *meaning* of the name Adummim; suffice it that Emek Adummim, 'valley of Adummim,' is a possible name for a portion of the great valley (עֵמֶק) of which the valley of the Elah (the *well-known* terebinth) was a smaller section. I prefer the former view, though it makes 1 S 17^{1} contain two discrepant statements. Löhr contents himself with referring to Buhl's *Geographie*, p. 90. Commentators make such references too easily, I think.

1 S 17^{6}.— וְכִידוֹן נְחשֶׁת בֵּין כְּתֵפָיו, R.V., 'and a javelin of brass was between his shoulders.' The commentators take this much too lightly. The Homeric passage (*Il.* ii. 45) quoted by Keil, Driver, etc., from Bochart, does not justify us as exegetes in making this weapon, unlike the other bronze weapons, one of attack. The translator in $\mathfrak{G}$ evidently felt this (*ἀσπὶς*). Full credit is due to Klostermann for recognizing this, but כִּיּוֹר, which he reads for כִּידוֹן, can hardly mean an oval concave metal plate. Probably כִּידוֹן should be כִּידָן, and rendered 'protection' (Ass. *kidânu*, 'protection'; see Del. *Ass. H.W.B.* 318 *a*; Muss-Arnolt, *Ass. Dict.* 373 *a*).

1 S 17^{52}.—'In order to make sense we must emend (with Kl.) to מדרך שערים, or better בְּהֶרֶךְ משערים,—that the wounded fell *all the way* from the battlefield to the two cities is information which is quite in place.' I do not think that our commentator has been quite exacting enough. As Grätz has already pointed out, ועד־גת ועד־עקרון (E.V. 'even unto Gath and unto Ekron') is a dittogram. And so also, virtually, is שערים. Observe that שערי עקרון occurs just before. Adopting this view, we get this much-improved close of the passage, 'And the mortally wounded of the Philistines fell in the way.' Where the 'way' led to is sufficiently shown by what precedes.

1 S 17^{54}.—R.V., following the M.T. and the LXX, gives: 'And David took the head of the Philistine, and brought it to Jerusalem; but he put his armour in his tent.' Professor Kirkpatrick (cf. Thrupp in Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 187) supposes that Nob, 'which was close to Jerusalem,' is really meant; Professor Driver, with most, supposes an anachronism. 'His tent,' according to Thenius and (recently) Löhr, means David's dwelling; Driver and H. P. Smith, however, think that the tent occupied by David when on duty with Saul (18^{2-5}) is meant. The sense obtained thus far is not very good. No glossator could have failed to remember $21^{9\,[10]}$. The supposed anachronism, too, is highly improbable. I have little doubt that the true reading is, ויבאהו לשאול ואת־כליו שם באהל יהוה, 'and brought it to Saul, but his armour he placed in the tent of Yahwè.' From לשאול to ירושלם is an easy step; transposition of letters; then א and מ confounded as, *e.g.*, in Jg 14^{15} (on which see Moore). יהוה was probably written 'י; this became ו. Or else באהל אלהים was the reading. The final ם was not written; then the seemingly repeated letters dropped out. 'Nob'—if that is the true reading—is referred to ($21^{9\,[10]}$). The consideration of the true name of the city of the priest Ahimelech, on which I think that I have fresh light, I must reserve for another occasion. I ask permission to say, before passing on, that we analytic critics are, in my opinion, to blame for basing our analysis of the sources on an imperfectly corrected text. 'We are forced,' says Professor H. P. Smith, 'to regard the clause (containing the word ירולים) as an insertion of a late editor, in which case we shall regard the whole verse with suspicion.'

1 S 30^{30}.—Athach, עתך, is called in Jos 15^{42} M.T. עתר, though LXX has *ιθακ* = עתך. In 19^{7} both have עתר. 'A decision between the variants is not possible,' says Wellhausen, whose dictum is quoted as authoritative by Driver. Budde contents himself with referring to these two scholars. But Wellhausen wrote in 1871: it is surely quite time to reconsider the matter. Professor H. P. Smith suggests עֲרָד, 'Arad, an attractive correction, no doubt. But the *νοο*, *νομβε*, *ναγεβ* of certain MSS point either to נֹב, Nob (cf. Guérin, *Judée*, iii. 349), or to עֲנָב, Anab (Klostermann). Hebron is the next place mentioned in 1 S 30^{30}. In Jos 11^{21} B gives *αναβωθ* = ענבות, of which the mysterious Tochen (תֹּכֶן) in 1 Ch 4^{32}, עתך in 1 S 30^{30}, and עתר in Jos 15^{42} 19^{7}, are most probably corruptions. It so happens that there are at the present day two places called 'Anâb, the one the greater, the other the less. These may represent the Anaboth (if this reading may be accepted) or Grape-Towns.

1 S 31^{10}.—No doubt Lagarde (*Anmerk. zur griech. Uebersetz. der Prov.* p. iv) is right in reading הִקְעוּ for the תקעו of M.T.; cf. 2 S 21^{6}. So also Wellhausen, Grätz, Driver, Budde, Kittel, Löhr, Smith. Driver and Dillmann explain הִקְעוּ, 'they exposed.' But, then, how are we to account for וַיִּפְּלוּ, 'and they *fell* (both together),' 2 S 21^{9}? This certainly favours Robertson Smith's theory that precipitation from a rock is intended (*Religion of the Semites*[2], p. 419); archæologically and philologically the sense 'they precipitated' is fully justifiable. Nevertheless, this attractive theory must be rejected. The words 'before Yahwè' in 2 S 21^{9} cannot easily be made to accord with W. R. Smith's theory. Hence ויפלו must be corrupt. Klostermann corrects וַיִּתְלוּ, 'and they were hanged there' (LXX, ἐκεῖ). הִקְעוּ, however, must mean more than 'they exposed' (Driver, Dillmann); that is too vague a sense. The word seems to be a religious synonym for תלה; and for ויפלו in 2 S 21^{9}, we should probably read, with Klostermann, וַיִּתְלוּ, 'and they remained hanging there' (Ⓖ ἐκεῖ).

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

The Trials of Jesus Christ.

Your July notices of my little book on *The Trial of Jesus Christ* are so kindly that I should perhaps not take exception to the summing up on the title page: 'Was Jesus justly condemned to death?—Professor Dalman and Mr. Taylor Innes say Yes.'

But while I do not know what Professor Dalman has proclaimed from his Leipzig chair, I at least, speaking as a mere lawyer, have avoided saying of either of the condemnations that it was at all just. And with regard to that on which you exclusively found, the Hebrew one, what I have said rather implies that it was neither just nor legal.

I think indeed that 'the right issue was substantially raised,' and that it was met directly by the answer of Jesus to the high priest's question. But the putting of such a question to an accused

by the high priest I describe as 'the last violation of formal justice.' And the sentence which followed it I object to, on the ground that Christ's response to His judge 'could never release a Hebrew tribunal from the duty of weighing a claim to Messiahship.' 'The mere claim to be the Messiah was no crime.' I do not forget the argument of your summing up (not from me however) that 'He does far more than claim the Messiahship. . . . He claims to be on an equality with God. . . . They could not do otherwise, therefore, than go on to condemn Him.' But I have not as yet seen anything to satisfy me that if by Hebrew law the claim to be Messiah was no crime, the claim to be Messiah and Son of God too was a crime such as even barred inquiry into its falsehood or its truth. Accordingly, instead of maintaining 'the legality of their condemnation,' I conclude that a sentence 'which described a claim to be the fulfiller of the hopes of Israel as blasphemy' had neither the form nor fairness of justice, and I suggest that Caiaphas may have suddenly rent his clothes in a murderous 'inspiration of evil.'

It seems clear that I am not entitled to sit by Professor Dalman or any other who simply says Yes.

A. Taylor Innes.

Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

The 'Dictionary of the Bible': Addenda et Corrigenda.

W. T. Davison writes in the new volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 664: 'Origen (*Ep. ad Afric.*, § 4) tells us that, in the copies he used, as many as from *three or four to sixteen or nineteen verses* were lacking in some places.'

Dillmann, to whose article in the *Transactions of the Royal Prussian Academy of Science*, 1890, Davison refers, wrote there (p. 1350), on ground of the same passage of Origen (*Op.* T. p. 15 Delarue) that '*often* 3–4, *in several places* 14–19 *verses* were lacking.'

Whence this difference? Both statements are wrong. As I have shown fifteen years ago in the *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 4 (1884), p. 249, Origen follows the Hebrew manner of expressing 15 by 9 + 6 (ט+ו) to avoid the initials of the holy name יה. Greek copyists, who were not aware of that, confounded the text and wrote δέκα ἐννέα or δέκα ἓξ for ἐννέα καὶ ἓξ. The passage is the more interesting, because it is the oldest example we have of this use. Ed. König mentions this in his article on the book of *Judges* (but by a reference to his own book).

I hope the new Origen, which we are to expect from Berlin, will at last correct the text according to my suggestion, and thus the right reading will find its way also into commentaries and dictionaries of the Bible.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

The Chedorlaomer Tablets.

In a review in last month's Expository Times (p. 471*a*), Professor Sayce refers to the tablets discovered by Mr. Pinches and made known to the world by Professor Sayce himself at the Norwich Church Congress, (see *Report*, p. 187). He says now, 'I have often wondered, by the way, why no one has started the theory that the tablets were written by a Jewish exile in Babylonia?' Does the Professor mean that no one has started such a theory? If so, he must have overlooked the review of Maspero's book in the *Athenæum* for 24th April 1897, where, on p. 535*c*, the reviewer states that the tablets in question belong to so late a period that they 'might well have been written by scribes who were conversant with the Hebrew narrative of Genesis as possessed by the Jews in Babylon about 300 B.C.'

C. H. W. Johns.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

Bishop and Presbyter.

Bishop Lightfoot, in his *Philippians*, has a very celebrated note on 'the synonyms Bishop and Presbyter.' Since the publication of this note the question as to the identity of the two names in the apostolic age has been generally considered as closed, and it will perhaps appear merely quixotic and even impertinent to attempt to open the matter again. If only, however, for the sake of discussion, may permission be craved to reconsider the some half-dozen arguments which appear to Lightfoot to determine the matter?

1. In Ph 1^{1}, Paul salutes the 'bishops' and 'deacons.' Therefore, the argument is, since 'presbyters' are mentioned elsewhere as church officers, they must be identical with 'bishops.' But (1) might not the passage equally well substantiate the identity of 'presbyters' with 'deacons'? And (2) Lightfoot's identification begs the question: Were presbyters officials at all? The answer to which question, as regards the apostolic age and the Christian Church, would not seem so certain as is here implied.

2. In Ac 20^{17} Paul summons to Miletus the 'presbyters' of Ephesus. Then in 20^{28} he appeals to them as 'bishops.'—Now, waiving the interpretation of 'presbyters' in v.^{17} as *possibly* meaning 'presbyters who had been appointed bishops,' it may be admitted that the author, or composer, of Ac thought that the presbyters were officials. In Ac $15^{2.4.6.22}$ we have the phrase 'apostles and elders,' which indicates that he conceived of the 'elders' as a class, and probably an official class. But in 15^{23}, *where he is quoting a document*, he writes 'the apostles and the elder brethren' (R.V.), thereby designating the same persons whom he elsewhere calls 'apostles and elders.' If the document is real, *it* is certainly of the apostolic age; but there is not yet full agreement about the date of the *composition* or *redaction* of Ac. (May the difference of expression not point to a possible unification of the very divergent views regarding the date of Ac: the writer of Ac belongs to the second century, when 'presbyter' had acquired a technical signification, but quotes faithfully from records that belong to a time when the word was still used in its general sense?)

3. Lightfoot's third point is 1 P $5^{1.2}$, where presbyters are exhorted to 'fulfil the office of bishop' (ἐπισκοποῦντες).—Now it is not denied that the oversight of the flock would naturally be in the hands of the older members. But, besides, that the term πρεσβύτεροι is here used in a general sense is sustained by v.^{5}, 'Likewise ye younger,' νεώτεροι. The former are no more an official class than the latter.

4. In 1 Ti 3^{1-7} Paul describes the functions of 'bishops': in 3^{8-13} those of 'deacons': there is no mention of 'presbyters.'—But surely Paul's silence may as well be explained by the theory that 'presbyters' were not officials at all, as by the theory that they were 'bishops.' Lightfoot, however, goes on to say that Paul knew the term 'presbyter,' because in 1 Ti 5^{17-19} he uses it of Christian ministers. Now the phrase in 5^{17} is οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, which is translated (A.V. and R.V.), 'the elders that rule well.' This is understood as meaning 'the elders that discharge well the office of elder.' But may it not even more fitly signify, 'the elder brethren who rule (*i.e.* who have been made ἐπίσκοποι), and who discharge their duties faithfully.' Thus προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι are 'bishops,' and οἱ καλῶς προ. πρεσβ. signifies 'good bishops.' Then the πρεσβύτερος of v.^{17} will signify 'an elder of the kind referred to,' viz. one that rules well, or it may be taken quite generally.

5. Tit 1^{5-7}, 'ordain elders in every city . . . if any one be blameless . . . for a bishop must be blameless.' This is thought to present the identification still more plainly.—Now the word for 'ordain' in Tit 1^{5} is καταστήσῃς, 'thou shouldest ordain'; R.V. 'appoint.' Consider, then, the usage of καθίστημι. It can be followed (*a*) by an accusative and a predicative phrase, *e.g.* Mt 25^{21}, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω, 'I will set thee over many things.' Or (*b*) by a double accusative, *e.g.* He 7^{28}, ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς, 'for the law appointeth men (to be) high priests.' The question then about 1 Ti 1^{5} is whether 'elders' is the nearer or farther object, *i.e.* whether we should interpret 'ordain (members as) elders in every city,' or 'ordain elders in every city (to be bishops).' Now since καθίστημι had already acquired something of a technical or pregnant sense (*i.e.* appoint to church office), the latter interpretation would seem to be much the more preferable, and has a decisiveness which is lacking in the former. A similar verb is χειροτονέω. The N.T. examples of it (except one which is in question) would require two objects (cf. 2 Co 8^{19}, 'the brother . . . appointed to be a fellow-traveller'; also the pseudo-postscripts to 2 Ti and Tit—Timothy and Titus ordained *to be* bishops), and would require two accusatives. The exception is Ac 14^{23}, χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους, where there is only one accusative. Surely it may be the nearer as well as the farther.

6. Lightfoot quotes Clement (*Ad. Cor.* § 42) as saying that the apostles had 'appointed their first-fruits to be bishops and deacons.' In this reference, it is to be surmised, he wishes again to emphasize the absence of 'presbyters' except as included in 'bishops,' but, as we have seen above (1), this is not conclusive unless it be assumed that presbyters

were officials. About his second quotation from § 44 (where, after referring to the bishopric, Clement adds, 'Blessed are the presbyters who,' etc.), it may be said that it does not carry any conviction as to the identity of the two expressions. Perhaps to these extracts from Clement there might be added as more plausible than either of them the 'appointed elders' of § 54. But this, again, may be understood as meaning the elders who have been appointed, *i.e.* the bishops (*and* deacons?) as in (4) above.

7. In a note Lightfoot refers to the Peshito as commonly translating ἐπίσκοπος by the word *kashisho* (old, presbyter), but the Peshito can hardly be counted as giving evidence for apostolic, or even sub-apostolic, times.

In addition to Lightfoot's 'proofs' there are certain other passages which must be considered—

1. 1 P 5^1, where Peter calls himself συμπρεσβύτερος. Does this not seem to signify the official character of 'presbyter'? Not necessarily; it may only be his *apologia* for his boldness in exhorting the older members (see under 3 above).

2. 2 Jn 1^1, 3 Jn 1^1, 'John the elder.' But (*a*) if the Epistles are apostolic (which is widely questioned), then at least πρεσβύτερος, even technically, is wider than ἐπίσκοπος. (*b*) If the Epistles are of the second century, they hardly come into consideration here, since the question is one of apostolic usage.

3. 1 Ti 4^{14}, τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου—of the presbytery. Here, apparently, we have the 'presbyters' not only as an official class, but as an official body. And it must be admitted that this is a most crucial case. But it must be remembered that this usage of the word is a *hapax legomenon*. And, further, its significance cannot be more definite than πρεσβύτερος, *i.e.* for its meaning we are thrown back upon the question, What was a presbyter?

The results of this investigation of passages seem to be—

1. The word πρεσβύτερος has often a general signification, and in some cases, perhaps all, of an apparently technical meaning, the appearance is founded on a misunderstanding.

2. Whether πρεσβύτερος had, or had not, a technical meaning in the apostolic age depends upon the date of the composition of Ac, and of 2 and 3 Jn.

3. Even if Ac and 2 and 3 Jn are of the apostolic age, still πρεσβύτερος may be a name applied to διάκονος (Ac) as well as ἀπόστολος (2 and 3 Jn).

4. It follows from these that πρεσβύτερος is not a synonym of ἐπίσκοπος.

ALEXANDER GRIEVE.

Forfar.

Matthew xxi. 15, 16.

ALREADY several times it has been pointed out how words of Jesus gain force when retranslated into their Semitic dress. Compare, for instance: *mene manjan*, 'the hairs are numbered,' Mt 10^{30}, *raḳḳed* and *arḳed*, to *dance* and to *mourn*, Mt 11^{17}, etc. To these comes now an additional example with singular force, viz. Mt $21^{15.16}$. The children cry '*oshanna*,' אושענא; the Pharisees urge Him to bid them be silent, and Jesus refers to Ps 8^3, which, in the language of the Targum, sounds that God prepared ''*oshna*,' עושנא, strength out of the mouth of the children. That Jesus used Ps 22^1 in the language of the Targum is generally recognized, why not also Ps 8^3? The text of our Greek Matthew follows the Septuagint, and gives αἶνον, destroying by this translation the best force of the argument.

This observation is to be found in a recent book, which cannot be recommended enough, the *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* of Professor Zahn (vol. ii. p. 316). EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Divine Name Ša in the Old Testament.

THE recent contributions to the text of Hos. 5^{11} (see pp. 329 f., 375 ff.) have made readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES familiar with two divine names: the S. Arabian צו (Palmyrene צא, צו), and the old Hebrew שא (in בעשא for בעלשא). שא, moreover, is a well-known element in Palm. proper names, and has been identified with (Palm.) צא by Prætorius (*ZDMG*, xxviii. p. 512), and with both צא and Heb. שא by Kerber (*Hebr. Eigennam.*, p. 49). But it unfortunately happens that however sure we may be of the S. Arab. צו and Heb. שא, we cannot be certain of the Palm. deities צא and שא (see *PSBA*, xxi. Part 5). Baethgen has suggested that צא is abbreviated from רצו. Professor König,

I know, rejects this view as untenable (see p. 376), but it is still considered *possible* by Lidzbarski (*Handb. d. Nordsem. Epig.*, 1898), Wellhausen (*Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1899, No 3, p. 245), and J. Mordtmann (*Palmyrenisches*, 1899, p. 48). The צו in עבדצו must also be queried, since it appears that the reading עבדצו is unsafe, a point which I omitted to record in my *Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions*.

The Palm. names compounded with שא are אלהשא, אמרשא, תימשא, עלישא, עתשא, and רמשא. In the case of the first four, Prætorius (*loc. cit.*) explained שא as an abbreviation of שמשא—the two remaining names were not then known. Now, according to de Vogüé and Ledrain (see also Gray, *Heb. Prop. Names*, p. 23), אלהשא stands for אלה־נשא, and this explanation has been applied further to רמשא and עתשא (*e.g.* by Ledrain). But by the side of עתשא we have the Sinaitic name עתשו, and the question arises whether the Aram. א has not interchanged with the Arab. ו (for examples see Wellh., *op. cit.* p. 246), in which case the ש is radical. Similarly, the analogy of the Phœn. עלשי, עלשת suggests that עלישא is from √עלש, and with some diffidence one is tempted to connect רמשא with the S. Arab. name رمشو.

From this it is evident that the element שא in Palm. is not necessarily a divine name, unless it be an abbreviation of שמשא (which is certainly the case with אמרשא, Gr. transcription αμρισαμσου), and it is possibly for this reason that Wellhausen has not repeated his explanation of בעשא in the second edition of his *Reste Arab. Heidentums* (1897). But instead of seeking a parallel to the name Baasha in the Palmyrene inscriptions of the Christian era, let us turn to names in use among the Hebrews themselves which belong to an age almost contemporaneous with that of the Israelite king.

It is surely difficult to explain the element יַשִׁי in the well-known name Abishai (אבישי) from the late Heb. יֵשׁ 'present' (of doubtful origin), and surely Wellhausen is again right in treating Abishai as a theophorous name (*Isr. u. Jüd. Gesch.*, 3rd ed. 1897, p. 24, n. 2). יַשִׁי, then, is an old divine name which we can scarcely separate from יָשָׁא in בע[ל]שא. The same element probably recurs in יִשַׁי (for Abishai?), and the identity of the two forms יַשִׁי and יָשָׁא appears from the names עַמְשָׁא, עַמְשַׁי, etc., which should almost certainly be pronounced עַמְשָׁא, עַמְשַׁי (Wellh. *l.c.*; Marquart, *Fundamenta*, p. 24; see Gray, *op. cit.* p. 323). To these theophorous names we should probably add חוּשַׁי for אֲחוּשַׁי; the fuller form is perhaps found in 1 K 4^6 where אֲחִישָׁר may be a mistake for אֲחִישַׁי. The variation in the case-ending is, of course, no difficulty, we meet with it again in the obscure Judæan clan-name Ahumai (אחומי) (1 Ch 4^2), for which the Versions suggest אחימי (Gray, *op. cit.* p. 279, n. 10); the correct reading is perhaps אֲחִישַׁי or אֲחִישַׁי. Yet another example may be seen in the feminine name יְרוּשָׁא or יְרוּשָׁה (2 Ki 15^{33}, 2 Chr 27^1), which seems to be a compound of יְרוּ and שָׁא, similar to יְרִיאֵל, יְרִיחוּ, and יְרַבְעַל (so Wellh.). The form with final ה is probably due to an incorrect derivation from ירשׁ, as though 'taken possession of, *i.e.* married' (the meaning doubtfully suggested in the *Oxf. Heb. Lex.*).

Finally, a word as to the meaning of the Hebrew divine name Ša or Šai. Two courses are open. We may either adopt Professor Cheyne's suggestion and connect it with the S. Arab شو (see p. 375), or we may accept the conjecture in Wellh. *l.c.*, that it is an abbreviation of שַׁדַּי (cf. Palm. אמרשא above). It may, perhaps, be more than a coincidence that in Hebrew the compounds of Ša (Šai), and the names En-Shemesh, Beth-Shemesh, Ir-Shemesh, and Samson agree in being associated chiefly with Judæan territory.

STANLEY A. COOK.

London.

The God Mani.

I AM most grateful to Professor Eb. Nestle for his kindly given information about the god Mani. His reference to p. 733 of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* of October 1892 should be corrected to p. 773. Mr. Davis there quotes, from Lenormant apparently, the name of 'Manu the great.' He says this was one of the minor gods enumerated as worshipped in the temple of Ninib, in the city of Asshur, and gives as his authority 3 R. 66, 2c. The name is actually there, l. 2, col. 3. Lenormant (*La Magie chez les Chaldéens*, p. 110) says: '*Manou le grand, qui préside au sort, ainsi que la déesse Mamit.*'

One wonders how he knew all that. The Egyptian Men is tempting, but more facts are needed yet.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

Queens' College Cambridge.

Three Proper Names in the New Testament.

1. Ac 1^{23} we read of Joseph called Barsabbas, who *was surnamed Justus*. The case is a little different from Ac 4^{31}, where it is expressly stated that the surname Barnabas was given *by the apostles*. This Roman surname, as is said by G. T. PURVES (*Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 778), was doubtless assumed after the manner frequent among the Jews at that time. Now it is interesting that we have an explicit Jewish testimony for this very name. Bar-Kappara, who belongs to the first generation of the Jewish teachers, called Amoraë, polemizing against the custom of adopting Roman names, says (*Wajikra rabba*, c. 32; comp. *Pesikta de Rab Kahana*, ed. Buber, p. 83*b*): לא הו קורין . . . ליוסף לסטים, 'They did not call Joseph *Justus*'; '*Lstis*' being a corrupt form for Justus, as *Lulianus*, among Jews and Syrians, for Julianus.

2. The same passage of Bar-Kappara must be quoted for Mk 15^{21}, 'the father of *Alexander* and *Rufus*'; for the other examples, which he gives there, are לא היו קרין לראובן רופא לבנימין אלכסנדר . . . 'they did not call Reuben *Rufus* nor Benjamin *Alexander*.' Why the names Reuben and Rufus were interchanged is clear, but how it came that Alexander took the place of Benjamin I do not know; perhaps because the first king, Saul, was from this tribe. It has long been noticed how frequent the name Alexander was among Jews; in the N.T. it occurs five times, belonging apparently to as many distinct persons. In the *Sepher Juchasin* a quaint reason is given for this frequency. When Alexander visited the temple, he wished to leave there his statue in gold as a memorial; but the high priest, Simon, knew a better memorial than this: all boys to be born in that year were to be called Alexander.

For the last couple, adduced by Bar-Kappara, *Juda-Julianus*, we have no example in the New Testament.

I owe this reference to a recently published book (H. P. Chajes, *Markus-Studien*, Berlin, 1899); but I must warn the readers, for this is one of few useful notices to be gathered there.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Hittite Inscriptions.

I.

I DID not until 24th June see Professor Jensen's demand (in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of June) that I should explain more fully why I objected to his statements about Professor Sayce's relations to his decipherment of the 'Hittite' inscriptions.

In the passage to which I took exception (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, April), Professor Jensen implied that, before his (Jensen's) 'decipherment' of those inscriptions had been published, Professor Sayce 'considered himself as the decipherer' of the inscriptions; but that when Jensen's decipherment appeared, Sayce found that his own decipherment was wrong, abandoned his attempt, and 'acknowledged his mistake' in the vague words which he used in 1898: 'The decipherment has at last been brought within measurable distance by some newly discovered inscriptions from Cappadocia.' Professor Jensen further insinuated that Sayce was unwilling to 'pursue further the path of confession,—an unpleasant one to be sure,'—and 'to confess that another had been more successful than himself.'

This passage gives an entirely misleading view of the situation.

In letters and conversation, on many different occasions, beginning from about 1882 (though I cannot give an exact date), Professor Sayce said to me that the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions was impossible without further discoveries: a bilingual inscription of at least moderate length was necessary: the path he pursued at first led up to a certain point and then ended: it enabled a certain small number of values to be determined, but no more. This 'confession,' as Professor Jensen calls it, was made time after time, years before Jensen began to publish his decipherment, and did not imply, and does not yet imply, that Sayce gave up his own attempts and results. As far as I know, he has always considered, and still is disposed to think, that those attempts were on the right lines, and that the results are likely to be confirmed when the discovery of bilingual inscriptions puts to the test all the various attempts at decipherment.

Professor Jensen must wait patiently the progress of discovery. It is practically certain that bilingual inscriptions will be found; and then his correctness will be proved or disproved. He, and I, and others have to expect the decisive test of coming discovery for our theories. If he be wise, he will not complain that his rivals, when they disbelieve his theories, are dishonest, but will join his efforts to theirs in promoting discovery and hastening the final test. Being so sure, he can afford all the better to wait.

W. M. RAMSAY.

Aberdeen University.

II.

THANKS to the kindness of Professor Bevan I have been enabled most opportunely to make the acquaintance of the seal cylinder which, according to Hommel, raises it above all doubt 'that the hieroglyph' resembling a serpent refers to a Hittite god (Jarkhu). I now perceive to my sorrow that Hommel spoke truth when he maintained my poverty as an Assyriologist. For before this Assyrian seal I can only stand helpless and aghast, since I cannot in the least imagine what possible conclusions Hommel can draw from it on his behalf. A happy idea strikes me,—there seems one possibility. We see on this cylinder an *Assyrian goddess*, presumably Ishtar or Astarte, since she stands upon two lions, holding in her hand an object not easy of definition, but probably a flower. Perhaps Hommel deduces from this that the *Hittite serpent* hieroglyph is the symbol of a *Hittite god*? But how? Herr, dunkel ist der Rede Sinn! I see I am indeed too dull for 'Hittite decipherment.'

Marburg. P. JENSEN.

The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus.

THE publication of the Cambridge fragments of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus gives me no occasion to alter anything in my essay on the origin of this translation, but makes one or two additions desirable.

1. These fragments contain a proof of fabrication that is not indeed stronger, but more striking than those with which the Oxford fragments abound: for here over and over again we have *two renderings of the same verse*, one according to each version; and the mistranslations here are particularly gross. I copy out three cases from one page. 30^{20} (an unpleasant verse) is translated twice. The Greek has εὐνοῦχος, the Syriac *m'haymnā* (meaning the same). The Hebrew renders the first rightly by סרים (badly misspelt), the second by נאמן! There is a Syriac grammar in which Mt 19^{12} is similarly rendered 'se sont faits des croyants.' 30^{17}. The Greek has ἔμμονον, the Syriac *ḳayyām* (meaning the same). The Hebrew renders the verse twice; for ἔμμονον it has נאמן, for *ḳayyām*, עומד! 30^{12} is also rendered twice; the Greek has θλάσον, the Syriac *paḳḳa'*. The first is rendered רציץ, the second בקע! 'The poor lad's loins are to be split!'

2. Of the extraordinary number of blunders which this translation exhibits, the following two are, I think, the most striking:—32^{5}. משפט שיר for σύγκριμα μουσικῶν, which savours of the fourth form of a grammar school; and רין for *duwānā*, 'grief,' $30^{21.23}$, etc.

3. The Arabic words are very numerous; I think the most extraordinary is חלק for 'to create.' The translator must have had some ground for employing this word, since he cannot have been ignorant of the Hebrew ברא. He probably wanted a word meaning 'to form,' and avoided the Hebrew ברא, as implying creation from nothing. See, however, Payne Smith, col. 600, where we perceive that the Syriac word used here is glossed in all the dictionaries by the Arabic word which the Hebrew translator employs (38^{1}).

4. The Baghdad Jew was evidently a physician, a very natural profession for him to follow; hence he alters the wish that a sinner may fall into the hands of a physician into a wish that he may give himself airs in a physician's presence (38^{15}). The margin suggests (in Arabic) 'may he have to hire one!'

5. It would seem difficult to outdo the mistakes of the Baghdad Jew; but Dr. Schechter has succeeded. He explains the fact that the differences between Greek and Hebrew are explicable from Persian by supposing that the Greek may have been made from a Persian translation of the Hebrew. The Greek translation was made before 100 B.C., and we have MSS. of it earlier than 500 A.D.; and the Persian language did not come into existence before 650 A.D.!

6. 'Saadyah Gaon,' however, is able to perform the marvellous feat of outdoing Dr. Schechter. For this writer asserts that Ben-Sira not only composed a book resembling Proverbs, but cut it up into verses *and gave it points and accents!* Points and accents were certainly not invented before 500 A.D., and Ben-Sira wrote about 200 B.C. Truly both Ben-Sira and his grandson were marvellous people, and it is absurd to say with 'Saadyah Gaon' that there is nothing miraculous about Ecclesiasticus. Ben-Sira gives his book points that were invented about 800 years after his death; and his grandson translates from a version in a language that did not start into existence till 750 years after *his* death! I hope there are some of the family still living! The odd thing is that Saadyah in his other writings shows that he knows almost exactly when the points were invented, and that he was one of the acutest critics that ever lived.

7. Perhaps Dr. Schechter, when the delights of authorship are over, will learn that it is dangerous to quote books one has not read, and to write about subjects with which one has little acquaintance.

Oxford. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

HAS the Gospel of the Reformation become antiquated? That is the question which Professor Loofs of Halle asks in the *American Journal of Theology* for the current quarter. The form of the question will not appeal to English readers universally. There are those amongst us for whom the Reformation has lost its interest. There are those for whom any interest it retains is one of repugnance. But the importance of the question does not lie in its form. The question is whether the gospel which saved men in the sixteenth century is able to save men still. The expression which the Reformers gave to the gospel is chosen because it is easily got at, and because it was to them an undeniable reality—something for which, as one of them put it, they were willing to die a thousand deaths.

Has the Gospel of the Reformation become antiquated then? Those English Christians who at once answer Yes, because all that the word Reformation denotes has become antiquated to them, misunderstand. Let them wait a little. But there are others who answer Yes. There are those who say that the intellectual world of to-day is so different from the intellectual world of Luther's day that it is not possible for the things which appealed to Luther to appeal to us. Luther's intellectual world was the pre-Copernican mediæval world. It was peopled with devils. It was contracted by a puerile view of the age of the earth and of the very meaning of history. It was fettered by a temporary conception of the inspiration and authority of Scripture. It is impossible to go back to the Reformation. The spirit of modern times finds nothing congenial earlier than the beginning of the eighteenth century.

That objection is largely valid. Our world is not Luther's world. We cannot think ourselves into Luther's intellectual inheritance. We may believe in a personal Spirit of evil,—Professor Loofs does so,—but we cannot throw our ink-bottle at him. And the very fact that we see the necessity of judging men in the light of their surroundings, shows that we have completely emerged from the Reformer's conception of history.

But the question has to be asked: Was the gospel which the Reformers preached, and by which they spiritually lived, so tied to their intellectual world that they stand or fall together? Professor Loofs answers No. There is a gospel for every age. It is the same gospel. Every age apprehends it according to its own intellectual possessions. When the age passes, its intel-

lectual peculiarities pass with it. But the gospel remains. In the next age it is again the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes.

Professor Loofs finds an illustration in Luther's language. Luther's language differs, at least in orthography, in about every third word from the German of to-day. One might reprint a sermon of Luther's and offer it to a modern German reader. He does not understand it. He may say it is not German. But it is the pedantry of a Chinese scholar that has insisted on reproducing every variety in spelling. Luther spoke the German tongue.

What, then, is the Gospel of the Reformation? Take Melancthon's definition: 'The gospel is essentially the offer of forgiveness and of justification through Christ' (*Evangelium est proprie promissio remissionis et justificationis propter Christum—Apol. Aug.* lxvii. 43). It is Melancthon's definition; it is quoted with almost immeasurable frequency by Luther. It is accepted by all the Reformers. It is the Gospel of the Reformation. Is it the gospel for to-day?

Modern thought has three objections to this gospel. The first is that it implies a moral relation between God and man which is not now generally admitted. It is denied that there is a God. Much more frequently it is denied that there is a God with whom we have to do. If not theoretically, at least practically, men live and move and have their being outside God. The picture which Professor Loofs paints of the practical disregard of God's claims by the middle classes in cities applies more accurately to Germany and America than to England or Scotland yet. But perhaps even of our own middle classes it is not untrue to say that 'here there are to be found thousands of men who seldom enter the doors of a church, perhaps never except on a great holiday. In their homes the last remnants of Christian family customs have disappeared; grace at meat, or family worship, are things unknown; reading matter is supplied by the daily newspaper.'

Now there is no doubt that the Gospel of the Reformation starts with the belief that there is a God with whom we have to do. It says that we have wronged God, that we are sinners in His sight. What point of contact has modern thought with that? The answer is that this attitude is not peculiar to modern thought. It may be more general to deny the claims of God to-day than it was in Luther's day. But the frequency of the denial does not alter the fact. In every Christian generation there have been many who lived with no fear of God before their eyes. Yet in every generation, as soon as men have come into contact with the gospel, they have cried, What must I do to be saved? Unless the gospel itself has lost its ancient power, there is nothing in the evidence that men do not now acknowledge God.

But the second objection is that in the modern world, even where God is acknowledged, it is not the forgiveness of sins that is desired but a higher moral life. The present age is not without its ideals, but they are ethical. The Gospel of the Reformers was religious. It insisted upon a relation to God, upon a right relation to God being established before an ethical life could begin. In short, its first doctrine was the forgiveness of sins. What contact can modern thought have with that?

Perhaps the shortest answer is that when men listen to the gospel they themselves discover still that the first thing is the forgiveness of sins. It has been true always, it is true still, that the knowledge of sin comes through the offer of forgiveness. 'I had not known sin,' said St. Paul, 'but by the Law.' Men who do not recognise the Law come to the knowledge of sin now by means of the gospel.

But there is more than that. The Reformers did not preach the forgiveness of sins *simpliciter*. In their mind it was associated with a life of

righteousness. It is true, and it is not surprising, that in that age of intellectual ferment, an age moreover in which the intellect gave itself so largely to the study of theology, a Flacius was found to express the opinion that the majority of men are converted upon their deathbeds. But the Reformation doctrine of the forgiveness of sins was unto newness of life. There then lies a point of contact with the modern spirit. Professor Loofs thinks we may lay more stress on the ethical result of forgiveness than Luther did. He would even be willing to reverse the order of presentation, and show that essentially the gospel is deliverance from sin, letting the forgiveness of past transgressions follow after. For he thinks that in this respect forgiveness of sins and newness of life are as faith and repentance—nothing is gained by standing upon the order of their going. If the modern thinker, creeping after an ethical ideal, finds it in Christ, he will come in time to the forgiveness of sins.

And this leads to the last part of the Reformers' Gospel and the last objection. The forgiveness of sins is 'through Christ' (*propter Christum*). Now there is no possibility of misunderstanding what the Reformers meant by the words 'through Christ.' They meant through the death and resurrection of Christ. Modern thought objects to that. It objects on two grounds. Forgiveness through the death and resurrection of Christ implies some kind of substitution, that in some sense Christ's work is taken for ours. And it involves a miraculous Christ.

The death of Christ, says the modern spirit, is not needed for forgiveness and justification, and it is not contained in the earliest documents. In the Old Testament the highest type of piety found forgiveness without any sacrifice. The prophets and even the Psalmists see no virtue in the blood of bulls and of goats. And this simplest belief is the earliest belief in the New Testament. The sacrificial creed, the creed that makes forgiveness rest on the finished work of Christ, is of later development, and owes its existence to the Apostle Paul. Go back to the Lord's Prayer—'Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors'—and the Parable of the Prodigal Son. There is no sacrifice and no substitution there.

Professor Loofs goes back to the earliest documents. And he finds that it is just they that do insist on sacrifice and substitution. To say that the simplest ideas are the earliest is plausible, but the facts are against it. The earliest documents, so far as the science of biblical research can discern, are those that link the sinner's pardon to the death of Christ. 'Paul and the celebration of the Lord's Supper in primitive Christian churches,' says Professor Loofs, 'furnish us with chronologically the oldest testimony to the valuation of the death of Jesus in ancient Christianity.' It is true that to the prophets and Psalmists 'the sacrifices of the Lord are a broken spirit.' But it is not in accordance with modern thought to deny a development beyond that simple creed, or to refuse to see its explanation and justification in the sacrifice on Calvary. Professor Loofs would not press the old solution of 'faith in a Christ that is to come.' He even calls that an untenable assumption. But the whole necessity is met by the simple formula that the Old Testament is laid open in the New (*vetus testamentum in novo patet*). Again, it is true that the Parable of the Prodigal Son makes no mention of the death of Christ. But that parable has another office to perform than to develop a complete 'theology of the cross.' And it is not to be forgotten that the simple words of Jesus, 'Thy sins are forgiven,' brought consolation, and the Parable of the Prodigal Son carried a positive teaching, to His hearers *only on condition that they trusted in Him who spoke these things*.

But no doubt the great difficulty which the modern mind experiences in resting salvation on the cross of Christ arises from the fact that His death involves His resurrection, or, in other words, a miraculous Christ.

This difficulty never occurred to Luther. 'From the days of their childhood,' says Professor Loofs, 'the whole field of biblical story was to the Reformers a well-authenticated wonderland. Its central figure was the Lord, the eternal Son of God made man, whom angels accompanied to earth, whom angels waited upon as He ascended to heaven, a Lord over sickness, pain, and death, who revealed His glory in ministering to others; a Lord over death and the grave, even in His victorious resurrection and ascension to the right hand of God's majesty.' But that is all altered now. Men find that the laws of nature reign supreme in the physical world. They posit analogous laws for psychic life. Outside and above nature there may be an Existence—the best modern thought finds no occasion to deny that or to affirm it. But history is written and God is left out. The old religious view of history, which regarded the living God as in active exercise of His sovereignty in this world, has ceased to be.

Now Professor Loofs is willing to surrender the Reformers' view of history, if necessary, and even their conception of the Saviour. He believes that it *is* necessary to surrender something of both. For he says 'it is beyond all doubt, beyond all need of proof: (1) that many of Luther's representations of the life, the person and the work of Christ, have their origin entirely in the fact that Luther accepted as indisputable everything that is narrated by the Holy Scripture; and, furthermore, that he interpreted the Scriptures according to the standard of mediæval traditions which he had retained; and (2) that this valuation of the Scriptures as the *verbaliter* inspired Word of God, and certainly his acceptance of erroneous mediæval traditions concerning Scripture interpretation, do not stand in any constant inner connexion with his central thought.'

Consequently Professor Loofs regards as the temporary garb of the Gospel of the Reformation, everything which originates solely in the Reformers' valuation of Scripture. But after these things have been taken away, he finds five elements remaining. These are: (1) that in the Holy Scripture we have the Word of God addressed to man; (2) that the Holy Spirit of God generates faith in us through the Word; (3) that Christ's death is the act performed for our salvation; (4) that Christ rose from the dead; and (5) that Christ is the revelation of the Father. These five stand in such inner and constant connexion with Luther's 'offer of pardon' that each becomes a distinguishing mark of the gospel. And these five abide. Whereupon Professor Loofs offers a new definition of the Gospel of the Reformation. It is a definition that he says he can advance with a clear conscience, in the face of all criticisms to which it may be subjected in the name of the modern science of history. This is his definition: 'The Gospel of the Reformation is the message of God to our humanity, offering us justification only through faith in Jesus Christ the Saviour, in whom the eternal God has revealed Himself to the world in the life of a human person, by whose death and resurrection He has redeemed us from sin and death.'

Now in that definition there are more things lacking than some of us care to see. Professor Loofs admits that. And he proceeds to justify the omissions first of all. There are those, he says, who desire to see all the details of the Apostles' Creed, and of its explanation by Luther, incorporated into the conception of the Gospel of the Reformation. In particular they demand that there be included in the definition of the gospel these three things: that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary; that the Ascension was a distinct event, separated from the resurrection by a period of forty days; and that our redemption is out of the power of the devil.

Professor Loofs cannot admit these three. They were taught by Luther, but they are not essential to his gospel. They are believed by most Christian teachers still, but they are not essential to the gospel for to-day. The objection

to including the virgin-birth and the Ascension on the fortieth day is that the textual evidence is so weak. 'Anyone,' says Professor Loofs, 'who understands anything about historical criticism must concede that the virgin-birth and the ascension on the fortieth day belong to the least credible of New Testament traditions.' We ought not, therefore, he contends, to weight our gospel with them. It is the special time of the Ascension that is the difficulty, 'that the resurrection is inconceivable without a subsequent ascension I concede.' And that the virgin-birth does not belong to the gospel in the restricted sense is evident, for 'otherwise we should have to consider the salvation of a Christian maiden seriously jeopardized by her failure to understand the *natus ex virgine*.'

The rescue from the power of the devil is a more serious difficulty. For Professor Loofs admits that as a conception it is not peculiar to Luther and Luther's interpretation of the world, but that it is part of the early Christian conception, and is found in the earliest and best attested Christian sources. But it is not essential to the gospel. And inasmuch as it is to-day a serious impediment in the way of the reception of the gospel, Professor Loofs believes that the Lord, who reproached the scribes because they laid unbearable burdens on the shoulders of their disciples, will honour the fidelity which, for the sake of seekers after salvation, declares it to be a duty not to include in the gospel, as an inseparable part of it, things which are not only by their nature separable from it and uncertain, but which are, moreover, liable to become a cause of offence.

And then the way lies open for the acceptance of a miraculous Christ—the way lies open to everybody. There are three arguments in its favour which appeal to the modern mind. The reports which we possess of His deeds and experience, particularly of His resurrection, are so consistent and reliable; the belief in this Christ has, since the days of the apostles, proved its supramundane power in many thousands of men; and, above all, there is Christ's own self-consciousness. And Professor Loofs, after quoting the relevant and irrefragable passages, says that, in the face of Christ's own claims, we must now more than ever conclude either that Jesus was a self-deluded fanatic, or that He is more than a link in the chain of naturally conditioned human history.

In Eph 4^8 and elsewhere, St. Paul introduces a quotation by the phrase, 'Wherefore he (or it) saith' (διὸ λέγει). Some commentators supply the subject 'God,' and some the subject 'Scripture.' Dr. T. K. Abbott, in the International Commentary on Ephesians, sees no need for either subject. To introduce such a subject is, he says, to force upon the apostle a form of expression consistent only with the extreme view of verbal inspiration. He takes the phrase as impersonal and indefinite. The translation ought to be simply, 'Wherefore it is said.'

Dr. Abbott is afraid of the extreme view of verbal inspiration. Dr. Warfield of Princeton is not. That sentence of Dr. Abbott's has led Dr. Warfield to write a long article to the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, which appears in its issue for July. The purpose of Dr. Warfield's article is plainly to show that St. Paul's method of quoting the Old Testament is consistent only with the view of inspiration which Dr. Abbott fears. He carries out his purpose by investigating the meaning of the phrases which introduce a quotation wherever they are found.

There are three such phrases of introduction. Sometimes, says Dr. Warfield, we find 'God says,' sometimes 'Scripture says,' and sometimes simply 'it (or he) says.' Now Dr. Warfield has no difficulty in showing that the first two phrases are absolutely identical. We sometimes read 'God says,' when, on turning to the passage in the Old Testament, we find that God is not the speaker. Again, we sometimes read 'the Scripture says,' when we find that in the original passage the

words come directly from the mouth of God Himself. Take, on the one side, Ro 9^{17}, 'The Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up.' And, on the other side, take He 1^{6}, 'And when he again bringeth in the firstborn into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.'

Dr. Warfield gives several examples on both sides. And then he expresses the conclusion that the two sets of passages, together, show an absolute identification, in the minds of these writers, of 'Scripture' with the speaking God. In the minds of these writers what God says Scripture says, and what Scripture says God says.

Then Dr. Warfield proceeds to examine the use of the phrase, 'It (or he) says.' He believes that in every case of its occurrence a subject should be supplied. Either it should be 'God,' or it should be 'Scripture.' And since in his belief these subjects are identical, he does not care which. But he will not have it that in any instance the phrase is impersonal, and ought to be translated, 'it is said.'

There is just one passage which presents a real difficulty. It is Eph 5^{14}, 'Wherefore he saith (διὸ λέγει), Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' That quotation is not easily found in the Old Testament. Dr. Warfield thinks he finds it in Is 60^{1}. But we are bound to say that he does not make that out. The resemblance between Is 60^{1} and Eph 5^{14} is too slight. Most commentators of authority take it to be a quotation from some early Christian hymn.

But if Eph 5^{14} is not a quotation from the Old Testament, Dr. Warfield's position is swept away. For there seem to be but two alternatives. Either St. Paul knew that it was not a quotation from the Old Testament, and yet used the phrase in question as he introduced it. In that case the phrase must be translated impersonally, 'It is said.' Or else St. Paul unconsciously quoted as from the Old Testament Scriptures what is actually not contained in them. And that is still more fatal to Dr. Warfield's theory of verbal inspiration.

There was a time when, in our alarm at the ravages of the Higher Criticism, we looked for succour to Archæology. We were encouraged so to do. There were archæological authorities of the first rank who held out the hope that before the guns of archæology the Higher Criticism would fall to pieces. But when Professor Sayce wrote his *Higher Criticism and the Monuments* and Professor Hommel his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* we saw that there was a mistake. We were not concerned that this result or that of the higher critical processes should be pronounced permature or precarious. It was our theory of the inspiration of Scripture that we wanted to preserve. In their books which they wrote against the Higher Criticism, Sayce and Hommel shook that, and (if we were bound to believe them) riddled it, as no process or result of the Higher Criticism had ever done.

We deserved the disappointment. It was our duty to deal with all study of the Bible on its merits. It was wrong to clutch at such monuments as favoured our traditional exegesis. It was doubly wrong to set one monument against the Higher Critics, and shut our eyes to another. We were trying to make a base use of Archæology, and once more Egypt proved a broken reed that pierced the hand.

We are now learning that Archæology has a true and noble service to fulfil. And it has come, as all things do, just at the time to fulfil it. There is a certain degree of interest in the discovery (if it is a discovery) of the names, Jacob, Joseph, Chedorlaomer, and the like upon the monuments of Babylon. But these things are only the mint, anise, and cummin of history. We do not believe that the monuments will ever tell us more than we already know from the Bible of the

weightier matters of the life we have to live. We do not believe they will ever speak to us of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come until we tremble. That is not to be the service which Archæology has been sent to fulfil. But the time has come when the Bible is to be placed beside other literature. We have discovered that it was not dictated to any man or men by a voice from heaven. We have learned that it grew up slowly as great books always do, the noblest minds putting their noblest thought into it from generation to generation. And we have to answer the question: Wherein then does the Bible differ from the great religious writings of the world? Archæology has been sent to answer that.

At first the answer of Archæology seems to be that there is no difference. A book has just been published by Mr. John Murray of London entitled *Authority and Archæology*. It covers a wide field. Its field is the whole relation of the monuments to Biblical and Classical Literature. Various writers handle various parts. But we have chiefly to do at present with the part that comes first, of which the title is 'Hebrew Authority' and the writer Professor Driver of Oxford. Within the compass of a hundred and fifty pages Dr. Driver tells us all that the monuments have yielded yet touching the literature that is in the Bible. In quantity it is considerable, and in meaning it is unmistakable. It says quite plainly to us that wherever the uniqueness of our Bible lies, it is not in the literature it contains. The great fundamental narratives that underlie and gave the start to all the literature that the Bible contains are the common property of those Semitic nations of which the children of Israel were one.

At first, we say, the answer of Archæology seems to be that there is no difference. The story of the Creation is found in Babylonian tablets as well as in the Book of Genesis. It is found in unmistakable identity, sometimes the very words, sometimes the most important words, being one and the same in both. We look to find the story of Paradise on the monuments also. Already we see that the significant elements in it are best explained on the theory of Babylonian origin. In the great Babylonian Epic which narrates the exploits of Gilgamesh, the hero of Uruk, we find an episode which runs on parallel lines with our narrative of the Flood. So we are compelled to say that wherever the uniqueness of the Bible lies, it does not lie in this, that its contents were supernaturally conveyed to the writers thereof. Their place in the Bible is subsequent to their place on the monuments. We have even to acknowledge that our early Scripture narratives were derived from Babylon, that in so far as originality is concerned the worshippers of Bel and Merodach have the advantage over the worshippers of Jehovah.

Archæology has come to tell us that. And observe, it is just at the time when we had made the discovery that the old idea of dictation would not do. Without the monuments what theory of the composition of the Bible should we then have fallen back upon? Perhaps so crude and offensive a theory as that the earliest writers or reciters were the inventors of the narratives that have come down to us. We might have said that some early Biblical Homer sang the romance of the Creation from place to place, and each subsequent scribe wrote it down as best he could, whence we have the double narrative from two different pens. Archæology says No. These stories are older far than that, and greater. They pierce an antiquity that no crude theory of their origin can comprehend. They carry us back so far and across so many generations of men that we feel God's hand in them. At least we say that their slow development is after God's ways of working. We cannot tell when they were first conceived, we cannot tell by whom. But at least we are saved the misery of a Hebrew fiction and a huge imposture.

But that is not the service that Archæology has come to fulfil. It has come not to tell us that the Bible is at one with other Bibles, but that the Bible is alone. We find the story of Creation in

Babylonian. Good. We compare the two. The resemblances are unmistakable. The source of both is alike. But the difference is immeasurable. Take the narrative of the making of the gods. *Tiâmat* is the Hebrew *tĕhōm*, the 'deep' of Gn 1^2. So we read—

When the heaven above was not yet named,
And the land beneath yet bare no name,—
(While) the abyss, the primæval, their begetter,
Mummu-tiamat, the mother of them all,
Streamed with their waters commingled together,
When no field had yet been formed, no marsh-reed was yet to be seen,—
When of the gods still none had come forth,
No name had yet been named, no destiny yet fixed,
Then were born the gods [altogether?],
Lachmu and Lachamu came forth,
Long ages passed,
Anshar and Kishar were born;
Long were the days,
The gods Anu, [Inlil (*i.e.* Bel), and Ea were born].

That is the Babylonian; this is the Hebrew—

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

As mere literature, you say, the Hebrew is the better. It is terser, grander. But what is it as righteousness? You may demand millenniums before 'Then were born the gods altogether' became 'In the beginning God.' You are probably right to demand millenniums. For that is the way God works. But it is God—that is the point. In the Hebrew narrative of the Creation there is that divine spark which we call life, and we know that in God is life. The Babylonian narratives never would have formed the sentence 'In the beginning God created.' For they had not the vital spark. The uniqueness of the Bible lies in that. And Archæology has come just at the right moment to show us that.

Henry Barclay Swete.

By the Rev. J. H. Srawley, M.A., Selwyn College, Cambridge.

The subject of the present sketch occupies the chair of the Regius Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge. Dr. Swete is a biblical scholar and theologian of whom any university might well be proud. The extensive range of his biblical and patristic studies, his careful and exact scholarship, and the variety of his work have given him an eminent place among the scholars of to-day, and have secured for him the attention and respect of his fellow-labourers in the same fields of study.

It is not the purpose, however, of the writer of this sketch to attempt to appraise the merits of Dr. Swete. That is beyond his powers. To estimate the value of the work of any living man must always be a difficult and delicate task. Nor is it the writer's intention, however much personal indebtedness might induce him, to attempt anything in the way of a public eulogy, knowing how distasteful to the subject of this sketch anything of the kind would be. Accordingly, the present article will be confined as far as possible to illustrating the services which Dr. Swete has rendered to biblical and theological learning, by some account of his work, together with such personal details of his life as are likely to interest the reader.

Born in 1835, Henry Barclay Swete was educated at King's College, London, and Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, of which latter foundation he was a scholar. Among his university distinctions may be mentioned the Carus Prize in 1855 and the Members' Prize in 1857. In 1858 he graduated with First Class Honours in the Classical Tripos, and shortly afterwards was elected a Fellow of his College. For some years he was engaged in pastoral work, holding successively the curacies of Blagdon and All Saints', Cambridge. From 1869–77 he was occupied with College work as dean, tutor, and theological lecturer at his own college. It was during this period that his first great piece of theological work was done. This consisted of two essays on the history of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, published in 1873 and

PHOTO. J. PALMER CLARKE, CAMBRIDGE.

PROFESSOR H. B. SWETE, M.A., D.D.

1876. From 1877–90 he held the college living of Ashdon, a small country village in Essex. It will thus be seen that from the conclusion of his undergraduate days to the time of his recall to Cambridge in 1890 to occupy the professorship which he now holds, Dr. Swete has led a comparatively quiet and uneventful life. Over twenty years have been spent in pastoral work, and thirteen of these in a country village. During a portion of this time, however, from 1882–90, he fulfilled the duties of Professor of Pastoral Theology at King's College, London, of which he was elected a Fellow in 1891. But the retirement of an English country parsonage, in this case as in so many others, has been productive of good results to the cause of scholarship and learning, and if circumstances have conspired with Dr. Swete's natural shrinking from a life of publicity to give him sufficient leisure for study and literary work, the world of scholarship at least has good cause for gratitude. The somewhat uneventful course of these years was broken, however, by occasional travel, generally in search of health, including a visit to Egypt and Palestine in 1868–69, and to Asia Minor, Turkey, and Greece in 1888. More recently, in 1894, a similar cause led to an interesting visit to North Africa.

Dr. Swete is an indefatigable worker, as is evidenced by the amount of work which he has already produced. During his residence at Ashdon he published the two volumes of his critical edition of the commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia upon the Minor Epistles of St. Paul, including the Latin version and Greek fragments. The work is prefaced by a lengthy introduction, in which are discussed the text and history of the Latin translation, the exegetical value of the commentaries and their relation to other ancient commentaries, and, lastly, the doctrinal system of Theodore. A few years later, in 1887, Dr. Swete made a further contribution to the study of this extremely interesting Father in his article on Theodore in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. The whole of this work forms a solid contribution to patristic learning and a valuable aid to the student of the exegesis of St. Paul's Epistles.

Within the same period falls a still more valuable contribution to the same *Dictionary*, the article upon the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, which appeared in 1882 and embodied the results of his earlier studies. The history of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is a subject which Dr. Swete has made quite his own, and it is not too much to say of this article that it has become the *locus classicus* for students of the history of this portion of Christian doctrine. Quite recently Dr. Swete has made a further contribution to the subject by an article in the new *Dictionary of the Bible* edited by Dr. Hastings, in which he deals with the revelation of the Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha.

During the same period Dr. Swete began his work, of which we shall have to speak more fully later on, of editing a new edition of the Septuagint, the first volume of which was produced in 1887.

We have as yet said nothing of Dr. Swete's connexion with other scholars. In addition to the privilege of occasional intercourse with Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott, the friendship of Dr. Hort, and subsequently the association with him in theological work at Cambridge, have been especially fruitful to the cause of scholarship, and have further helped to identify Dr. Swete with the traditions and ideas of the Cambridge school of biblical criticism. It was especially to Dr. Hort's help and counsel that much of the plan and working out of the manual edition of the Cambridge Septuagint were due.

In 1890 Dr. Westcott, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, was consecrated Bishop of Durham, and Dr. Swete was appointed to succeed him in his professorial work at Cambridge. Hitherto his theological studies had been pursued amid other duties, but this new sphere enabled him to throw himself exclusively into theological teaching and work. The nine years which have elapsed since his appointment have been years of untiring work, though hampered at times by indifferent health. In addition to his professorial lectures, including courses on subjects connected with New Testament exegesis, Christian doctrine, and Church history, Dr. Swete has increasingly devoted himself to the task of arousing among younger Cambridge men an interest in biblical and theological studies, and stimulating them to original work and research. Those who have been privileged to study under his direction will not lightly forget his sympathetic and kindly manner, his readiness to devote time and trouble to aid those who seek his counsel, and still more his wide knowledge of the vast field of English and foreign theological literature.

But more especially has this new sphere of work set him free for literary labours. Since 1890 his productions have been numerous, and have attracted in an increasing degree the attention of scholars. In 1892 Trinity College, Dublin, recognised his work by conferring upon him the honorary degree of Litt.D.

We may select three of his productions as representative of the variety and quality of Dr. Swete's work. The first is the manual edition of the Septuagint. The history of this is given in the introduction to the first volume, which appeared in 1887. The work arose out of a scheme suggested to the Syndics of the University Press by Dr. Scrivener in 1875. The plan as finally adopted by the Committee included the preparation of two editions, based mainly upon the Vatican MS. The smaller edition, for which Dr. Swete has been responsible, was intended to prepare the way for a larger edition, which is now occupying the labours of two Cambridge scholars, and which will include an extensive *apparatus criticus* with Prolegomena. This smaller edition gives at the foot of the text the variations of a few of the most important uncial MSS, while appendices at the end of each volume present minor variations. The second volume appeared in 1891, and was followed in 1894 by a third, in which Dr. Swete received the assistance of two younger Cambridge scholars. It is easy to see how much the labours of the scholars who are engaged upon the larger edition have been lightened by this extensive piece of work, and the fact that it represents only one side of the literary activity of its editor, during the years of its progress, is a testimony to the variety of his interests and his productive power.

A small book, published in 1894, illustrates another side of Dr. Swete's work. It bears the title *The Apostles' Creed in Relation to Primitive Christianity*, and contains a criticism of Dr. Harnack's theories upon the Apostles' Creed, which had recently been made accessible to the English public in an article by Mrs. Humphry Ward in the *Nineteenth Century* for July 1893. This book illustrates in a conspicuous manner some of the best features of Dr. Swete's work. The scholarship is careful and exact, the doctrinal inferences are drawn in a clear and convincing manner, and above all there is a crisp, light touch about the style, which is one of the features of all Dr. Swete's literary work.

A third work, which only appeared in the autumn of last year, reveals Dr. Swete in yet another aspect, as a biblical commentator. By his recent edition of St. Mark's Gospel he has laid biblical students under a fresh debt of gratitude. Hitherto there has been no adequate work dealing with this Gospel, which probably represents the most primitive tradition of the Lord's earthly life. Dr. Swete's new book is an instalment towards the supply of this deficiency. That it is an instalment only is implied in the preface to the book, in which the author expresses the hope that it may be possible for him to deal in a subsequent volume with some of the larger questions with regard to St. Mark's Gospel which still await further investigation. But within the limits of the present work he has given to scholars, meanwhile, a careful exegesis of the text of the Gospel. As a commentator the author exhibits the same precise and careful scholarship, and the same neatness of style, as characterize his other work. He treats in a broad and liberal spirit questions of criticism, he brings to bear upon the interpretation of the text an extensive knowledge of the comments of patristic writers, and above all his treatment is reverent, and lends itself to the purposes of devotional study. The hasty reader will not always find a ready-made answer to his inquiries. The author has written for the better sort of students, and for them his commentary will often be found to suggest fresh ideas upon familiar passages.

There are, in conclusion, two fields of work in which we may with some confidence hope for further contributions in the future from Dr. Swete's pen. The first is, as we have said, a treatment of some of the questions arising out of St. Mark's Gospel. The second is the resumption of his earlier studies upon the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But he has already more than deserved our gratitude by the varied and extensive services which he has rendered to biblical and theological studies.

Besides occasional articles and pamphlets, the following is a list of Dr. Swete's more important works :—

1873.—*On the Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.*

1875.—*Theodorus Lascaris Junior, De Processione Spiritus Sancti Oratio Apologetica.*

1876.—*On the History of the Doctrine of the*

Procession of the Holy Spirit, from the Apostolic Age to the Death of Charlemagne.

1880–82.—*Theodore of Mopsuestia's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul.*

1882–87.—Articles upon the 'Holy Spirit' and 'Theodore of Mopsuestia,' in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography.*

1887–94.—*The Old Testament in Greek.* 2nd ed., 1895–98.

1893.—*Akhmîm Fragment of the Gospel of Peter.*

1894.—*The Apostles' Creed in Relation to Primitive Christianity.*

1895.—*Faith in Relation to Creed, Thought, and Life.*

1896.—*Church Services and Service Books before the Reformation.*

1897.—'The Oxyrhynchus Fragment': a Lecture delivered at Cambridge, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, September.

1898.—*The Gospel according to St. Mark*: the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices.

1899.—Art. 'HOLY SPIRIT,' in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.*

Professor Jülicher on the Parables of Jesus.[1]

BY THE REV. DAVID EATON, M.A., GLASGOW.

THIS is the second part of a work on the Parables, on which Professor Jülicher has been engaged for many years. The first part, which was published eleven years ago, and of which a second edition is promised, treated mainly of general principles; in the second part we have the detailed exposition in accordance with these principles. It is neither 'a book to be read in the Christian family nor a practical intepretation of the Parables, but simply a scientific commentary on all the parabolic sections of the synoptic Gospels.' The author's aim is to ascertain, in the case of each of these sections, how the evangelist or evangelists understood it; in the numerous instances where we have several recensions of the same saying or discourse, to state the differences with precision, and, when possible, to explain their origin; and, last of all, to find out what our Saviour really said and taught. He does not attempt a reconstruction of a Hebrew or Aramaic original form of our Lord's sayings; he is satisfied if he can in some measure ascertain the thoughts and moods of Jesus.

As indicated in the title, Dr. Jülicher confines himself to the synoptic Gospels. He divides his treatise into three sections: section 2 treating of the Parables strictly so called, and section 3 of 'example-narratives' (the compassionate Samaritan; the Pharisee and the Publican; the Foolish Rich Man; the Rich Man and Lazarus). In section 1, which extends to over 250 pages, he deals with our Lord's similes (the fig tree as a harbinger; the servant, who is bound to be always at work; the playing children; the blind as a leader of the blind; real defilement; the salt; the lamp on the stand; the city set on a hill; the eye as the light of the body; serving two masters; the tree and its fruits; the physician and the sick; the old garment, the old skins, and the old wine, etc. etc.).

As the result of his many years study of the subject, Professor Jülicher has produced a work of very great value. It is not only a great commentary on the Parables, but also an important contribution to the understanding of the mind of Jesus. It may safely be pronounced one of the best scientific commentaries of recent years on any part of the New Testament.

It is characterized from first to last by great thoroughness and fulness. Nothing seems to have been overlooked that could in any way be considered essential to such a work. We have sometimes the feeling that in discussing the meaning of words, the grammar, etc., it is too full; but the learned author has always arranged his material in a very lucid and sometimes even vivid manner.

[1] *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu.* Von D. Adolf Jülicher, Professor der Theologie in Marburg. Zweiter Theil. Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der drei ersten Evangelien. Freiburg i. B., Leipzig und Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr; London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1899. 8vo, pp. viii, 643. Price M.12.80.

He is utterly and consistently opposed to the habit of treating the Parables as allegories. Each parable teaches only one great lesson; we must employ all the means at our disposal to discover what that one great lesson is in the sphere from which the matter of the parable is drawn; *that* is the one truth that our Lord seeks to teach us in regard to the higher sphere in which He would have us supremely interested.

Professor Jülicher devotes much space to the attempt to ascertain from the frequently diverging reports of the Synoptists what our Lord actually said, and the connexion in which He said it. Such an attempt is well worth making. Experts, like B. Weiss, will doubtless have many objections to make to Jülicher's results; but it can at least be said that he has made the attempt with great circumspection.

The work is of such a nature that it is hardly possible to give a fair specimen of it in a brief form. We have, however, reproduced the substance of the exposition of Mk 7^{14-23}, Mt 15^{10-20} (*of real defilement*), and of Mt 20^{1-16} (*of the same wages for dissimilar work*), mainly with the view of showing that, while true to its character as a purely scientific commentary, it is full of material, which the practical expositor will know how to use with much profit.

Parable of Real Defilement.

Mk 7^{14-23}, Mt $15^{10f.15-20}$.

This parable attaches itself to a comprehensive debate beween Jesus and the Pharisees as to what is demanded by religious purity. To their reproachful question, why His disciples ate bread with unwashen hands, He replies with a keen attack upon their spurious piety: in favour of their worship of tradition, they render invalid the fundamental commandments of God. He now turns to another public; in spite of Mk 4^{12}, He desires not only to be heard, but also to be understood, by the common people (Mk v.^{14}, Mt v.^{10}). Mk v.^{15} is more original than Mt v.^{11}, but the alterations of the latter are of no consequence.

Both evangelists add an exact explanation of His saying to the multitude, given by Jesus to His disciples in private (Mk v.^{17}) at their special request. Matthew inserts vv.$^{12-14}$ from another source, and makes Peter the spokesman (v.^{15}). He begins His answer with a reproof (Mk v.^{18}, Mt v.^{16}). Neither they nor the multitude have understood Him. Not even among His intimate friends does He find the understanding which He might have counted upon even among the multitude, and that too in the case of so simple a parable. 'So' in Mk v.^{18} means, in so great a degree as your present question shows; Mt v.^{16} has 'yet.' However, He explains the saying to them, Mk vv. $^{18b.19}$; Mt v.^{17} is shorter, but here again the differences are of no great consequence. That which entereth into a man from without cannot defile him, because strictly speaking it does not enter into him; and so far as it does so, it is only for a short time; in reality it only *passes through* those organs that are common to man with the lower animals, and are not specifically human. The difficult expression at the end of Mk v.^{19} is a very ancient gloss, written on the margin by a reader who wished to prove himself not 'without understanding,' to the effect: here the Lord makes all meats clean.

In Mk v.^{20}, Mt v.^{18} Jesus repeats the positive half of His parable (Mk v.^{15}, Mt v.^{11}), with a few verbal changes; in the remaining verses He justifies His thesis. The catalogue of vices given in Mk embraces sins of thought, word, and deed: evil thoughts in all the forms in which they manifest themselves. Only such evils are mentioned as everyone, without any Pharisaic teaching, must acknowledge to be evil. 'Wickednesses' should probably be more specifically 'cheatings,' 'swindlings'; an 'evil eye' is grudging at another's prosperity; for 'foolishness' see Pr 26^{5-12}, Wis 10^{8} 12^{23}. That which in reality defiles a man are the manifestations of evil that proceed from his own heart. Mt v.$^{20b.}$ seems a happy return to the starting-point of the debate in v.^{2}; in reality, however, it is out of place, for, as we see from v.^{11a}, the question debated had become more comprehensive and profound.

We must not, because of the generality of the expression in Mt v.$^{16ff.}$, find here 'one of the strongest *dicta probantia* for the doctrine of the corruption of man's heart, and consequently for the doctrine of original sin.' As if Mt v.^{18} spoke of *everything* that proceeds out of the mouth. We might as logically infer from v.^{11} that, according to the Pharisees, *everything* that enters into the mouth defiles a man. The statement that 'whatsoever from without goeth into the man cannot defile him' must also

be understood *cum grano salis*; for Tertullian was right when he excepted evil things that enter into a man through the eyes or ears.

To the principle of Pharisaism, which regarded defilement as coming from without, our Saviour here opposes a new ethic, which calls only that unclean which depends on the will of man, and finds nothing sinful and morally defiling save that which a sinful heart produces. This is taught plainly in Mk vv.[18-23], where κοινοῦν is the only ambiguous term. κοινός means 'common, public, general' (Ac 2^{44} 4^{32} etc.); κοινοῦν, 'to make common.' But on the soil of particularistic Judaism, the 'general or universal' became synonymous with 'non-Jewish,' 'illegal'; and to a Pharisee κοινός naturally signified 'profane,' 'unholy,' and κοινοῦν 'to profane, to defile, to regard as, or make, unclean.' For this sense of these terms, see Ac $10^{14f.\ 28}$ $11^{8f.}$ 21^{28}, Ro 14^{14}, He 9^{13} 10^{29}, Rev 21^{27}; also 1 Mac $1^{47.\ 62}$ (4 Mac 7^{6} is the only place in the LXX where κοινοῦν occurs). To eat with 'common' hands (Mk vv.[2.\ 5]) is, according to the Pharisaic view, a violation of the religious-ethical duties of a Jew; the reproach, which Mark repels by his addition 'that is, unwashen,' lies in the κοιναῖς. Jesus and the Pharisees are at one as to the condition of the hands in the case before us; but they are at variance on the question, whether unwashen hands deserve the insulting predicate κοιναί. Jesus not only denies this, but He also makes use of the occasion to give a profound exposition of the truly religious conception κοινοῦν; this is at the same time also an exposition of the conception κοινόν; for only that which is itself unclean can (and of necessity must) produce uncleanness. The heart is the only subject of ethical qualities in man; seek not the unclean without you, where only your imagination finds it; seek it in yourselves, in your own evil hearts.

It is interesting to compare this passage with Mt 23^{24-28}. In the latter passage the teaching of the Pharisees as to cleanness is not replaced by a new teaching. They are, no doubt, exhorted to cleanse the inside; but they are to do so in order that the outside also may become clean. The new ethic, which turns round judgment, mercy, and faith is opposed to the pedantic tithing of dill and cummin; but with the addition, 'these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone.' Every prophet in Israel might have spoken in that way. But Mk $7^{18ff.}$ contains a new revelation, a radical break with Jewish ethics. Ethical qualities are reserved exclusively to the ethical personality (καρδία).

This 'cannot defile' of Jesus is certainly incompatible with Lev 11^{24}. But we must guard against exaggerations. It has been said that in Mk vv.[14f.] Jesus is attacking Mosaism and throwing the whole of the Mosaic legislation as to cleanness overboard; note how, when introducing the fifth commandment, He says 'Moses said' (Mk v.[10]), because here, where He is making ready to antiquate Mosaism in the most decisive manner, He could not well have used the formula 'God said.' But He is really saying nothing here either as to the division of foods into clean and unclean or as to Mosaism; an antithesis between 'Moses said' and 'God said' is no more conceivable in His mouth than in that of Paul. He has never declared any portions of Scripture, such as the laws regarding cleanness in the Pentateuch, to be abrogated; an abrogation of the commandment of God, which He, like His disciples, found in 'Moses,' is excluded in His case by Mk v.[8]; and it is hardly likely that in practice He transgressed the Mosaic laws as to foods. But with the legitimate authority of religious geniality He interpreted this divine law in accordance with the canon of His own conscience, and, without attacking or defending the Levitical laws as to foods, uttered an ethical principle, which inevitably led to the abrogation of large portions of the Mosaic law. It is one of His greatest deeds, to have abolished these Levitical laws by means of a loftier ethic.

Parable of Labourers.

Mt 20^{1-16}.

This is one of the two great parables that treat of the payment of wages in the kingdom of heaven. What we have presented to us here is the altogether similar reward of the most different classes of labourers. This is the point upon which the story fixes our attention. No stress should be laid on the fact that the householder agreed with the first class of labourers for a penny a day (v.[2]), with the second, third and fourth classes for whatsoever was right (v.[3ff.]), while in the case of the fifth class there was no mention of wages; nor on the fact that, according to their own account, the last class were willing to

work, if only some one would hire them (v.[7]). These receive a full day's wages, simply because their employer so wills it, and not in recognition of their previous willingness to work (v.[14f]). The text says nothing as to differences of mood in respect of delight in their work, trust in their employer, or value attached by themselves to their labour, on the part of the five groups; and consequently such considerations should not be dragged in in the explanation of the parable. Nor is there any hint that the householder was in any way dissatisfied with the work of those first hired or specially pleased with that of the last; we are left to infer that the work of all the five classes was of the usual average quality.

Not till the payment of the wages (vv.[8-15]) do we find anything surprising; and this is the *one point* of interest in the story. As prescribed in Lv 19[13] Dt 24[15], the labourers are paid at the close of their day's work. In this case the last-hired are paid first. This, however, does not constitute any preference of the one class to the others; the first-hired do not complain of it in v.[12]; it is a merely secondary feature, and only of importance here, because in this way the first became witnesses of the special generosity of their employer towards their comrades. The decisive point is the payment of the same wages to all alike (vv.[9. 10]), doubtless in accordance with the instructions given by the householder to his steward, though not mentioned in v.[8]. Upon this the first-hired, who hoped to receive more from such a liberal master, murmured at their unfair treatment (v.[10ff.]): we have not only laboured the whole day but have done so under the most disadvantageous circumstances; these have laboured only one hour, and that too in the cool of the evening; and yet thou hast made them equal unto us. Singling out one of these murmurers, the householder answers that he has done him no injustice; that it is his will to pay all alike; that he may surely do what he wills with his own; and that only envy could turn his liberality into a ground of complaint.

Every one must feel that the householder is in the right in spite of the murmuring of some of the labourers. He has shown liberality without being guilty of injustice; he has strictly fulfilled his duty and at the same time made use of his legal right in favour of poor fellow-men. And Jesus, by means of this parable, constrains us to judge in the same manner in connexion with the kingdom of heaven (v.[1]). According to Him, God bestows one and the same reward on all men, in spite of their very different performances, in inviting them to His feast and in receiving them into the blessedness of the kingdom of heaven. To the Jews, and especially the Pharisees, the great offence in Jesus' gospel was that He opened the doors of the kingdom to everyone who would enter in, so long as it was day; that He heartily invited the sinners as well as the righteous; that He even showed special favour to the former, inasmuch as He went after them, seeking them out and calling them; and that He did all this in the assurance that God willed it so. The Pharisees called this an overturning of God's righteousness, which recompenses each man in strict accordance with his life. Jesus refutes them by means of this parable. As certainly as the householder acted justly, when he paid the same wages to his day-labourers, in spite of the very different amount of their labour, so certainly does God act justly and in a way to which no exception can be taken, if He keeps the one kingdom of heaven open to all, sinners and righteous, who accept His invitation. Within the limits of righteousness, He can do what He wills with His own; and by their coming, their repentance, even if at a late hour, these poor sinners prove themselves worthy of His grace, so that there can be no talk of a foolish misspending of His blessings. The God, who has prepared only *one* salvation for all men, for high priests and elders as well as for publicans and sinners, does not deserve blame, but grateful acknowledgment, whether it be for the righteousness with which He keeps His promises to those who have kept His precepts, or for the goodness and liberality with which He rewards far above men's desert and worthiness, and pays wages even where there was almost nothing but hour-long, year-long, lifelong idleness to be blamed or punished.

This is all that Jesus thought of teaching in the parable. We must not deduce from it the dogma of the absolute equality of the blessed in the future world, which would contradict other genuine sayings of our Lord (*e.g.* Mt 19[28f.]). But Jesus is not seeking here to instruct us as to the forms of existence in eternal life; He is desirous of awakening in us a deep religious feeling, that, namely, of evangelical Christendom generally.

The originality of this parable is most evident when we compare it with the Jewish parallel in

the Talmud, etc. A Rabbi Bon, who died in his prime, is compared to a king who had hired many labourers for his vineyard. One of these excelled the others in diligence and skill. The king took him by the hand, went up and down with him, and at night paid him full wages like the rest. When these murmured, the king replied, Why find ye fault? This man has in two hours accomplished more than ye have done the whole day. So Rabbi Bon has done more for the law in twenty-eight years than another has done in one hundred years. Now, Jesus may possibly have known some such story as that of Rabbi Bon. But the main thing in a parable is not the material of which it is composed, but its meaning and tendency; and the parable of Jesus aims precisely at cutting up by the roots the religious standpoint of the Talmudic parable. The last-hired receive the same wages, not because they have, in one or two hours, accomplished as much as, or even more than, the others in a full day, but although they have worked far less; that which is opposed to the envious murmurers is not the *desert* of one who is only seemingly preferred, but God's goodness and liberality, which has a right to give freely, without desert, that which others have merited, and which never waives this its right. Our parable is, therefore, like Lk 15^{11-32}, one of the noblest documents of the new religion.

After mentioning rapidly the various allegorical interpretations of the parable, Professor Jülicher raises the question whether Matthew has inserted it in its proper connexion. If the parable stood alone by itself, v.[16] would mean: so, in the kingdom of heaven, every distinction between last and first will vanish (B. Weiss). But v.[16] is found substantially in 19^{30}, where it can only contain the warning: in the case of many the relative position of first and last will be *reversed* (cf. Lk 14^{7-11}); and Matthew, by inserting the parable in this place and by connecting it with what precedes by means of 'for' (v.[1]), makes its teaching bear upon that question. Now Jesus certainly taught frequently that the 'first,'—*i.e.* those who counted upon a sure reward of their great merit,—would be bitterly disappointed (*e.g.* Mt $21^{28-22^{14}}$). Here, however, the whole emphasis of His teaching falls upon the gracious exaltation of all the 'last.' Our parable, which is the *evangelium in nuce*, treats merely of God's great joy in freely giving to all who are willing to respond to His gracious invitation.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

ALFRED THE GREAT. Edited by Alfred Bowker. (*A. & C. Black.* Crown 8vo, pp. xiv, 260. 5s.)

Not many, it must be confessed, of the men to whose names the world has added 'Great' deserve the dignity. But Alfred does. At a most critical time, and under almost unparalleled difficulties, he accomplished a work so varied and so lasting that it looks like the work of ten men rather than of one. That he is *the* English hero goes without dispute. Why is it that the average Englishman does not make him so? We venture to suggest that the romance of that mythical Arthur, thanks to Malory and Lord Tennyson, has caught men's fancy to Alfred's loss. The one is even mixed in some men's minds with the other. When history is more reasonably studied and more generally remembered, King Alfred the Great will come to his rights.

And this book will help. For it is a great book, worthy of its great subject. Ten men, each a specialist in some department, have united to tell us what they know and believe of Alfred. The Poet Laureate opens with a poem on his spotless character. Sir Walter Besant sketches his time with its demands and difficulties. Mr. Frederic Harrison describes Alfred as king. And so on. It is a great book and eminently readable. After this book English ignorance of Alfred the Great is an unpardonable sin.

The Beds. Publishing Company has issued a lecture by the Rev. H. H. Scullard, M.A., of the Howard Congregational Church, Bedford, on *John Howard* (8vo, 2s.). The lecture is of more moment than lectures are expected to be. It is, in fact, a capable selection of the features and facts

of Howard's life and character, presenting a complete and impressive portrait. And the volume is enriched with many fine full-page engravings, four of which were got from Russia expressly for this work. The London agents are Messrs. Hazell, Watson, & Viney.

Mr. George Margoliouth of the British Museum has prepared a Descriptive List of *Syriac and Karshuni MSS* in the British Museum that have been acquired since 1873. The volume is a thin octavo, of interest to those who are interested, dry as the driven sand to others. It is a student's loving labour however; and the Trustees of the Museum will find that there are now many Syriac scholars who will welcome the volume.

'Studia Sinaitica No. vii.' is *An Arabic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Seven Catholic Epistles* from an eighth or ninth century manuscript in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, with a Treatise on the Triune Nature of God, and Translation from the same Codex. The volume is edited by Mrs. Gibson, and published in the well-known blue covers at the Cambridge University Press (4to, 7s. 6d. net).

The Treatise on the Triune Nature of God is a curious mixture. In places it is shrewd, everywhere it is pious, but its mistakes are marvellous. Mrs. Gibson points out some of the best of them. Zacharias the father of John the Baptist is identified with Zechariah the prophet, and Amoz the father of Isaiah with Amos the herdsman of Tekoa. He was a good man and a learned, this unknown theologian of the Middle Ages, and he knew his Bible a little—but he was not a higher critic.

SOCIAL WORSHIP. By John Clifford, M.A., D.D. (*Clarke*. 12mo, pp. 150. 1s. 6d.)

A preacher must preach to his audience. There are things here taken for granted which some audiences would demand proof of; there are also things proved which some audiences count axiomatic. Dr. Clifford's audience is plainly intellectual, and he preaches to the intellect. A more emotional audience would find him cold. He is always buoyant, however, if not exactly emotional. And he proves his points as much by his own heroic faith as by his clever argument.

Another Part has been published of the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 4to, pp. 529–614, 2s. 6d.). It is the seventh. Long time have we waited for it, but having come it is satisfactory. No other book we know has so much matter on a page, and every word is carefully weighed. Indeed, it is more than a Lexicon, it is also a Dictionary and Concordance.

In the Mile End Road there is established a printer's press which is called the Essex House Press. Its aim is to keep living the traditions of good printing that William Morris had revived. The first volume printed at the Essex House Press was *The Treatises of Benvenuto Cellini on Metal Work and Sculpture*. The second is before us.

It is *The Hymn of Bardaisan*, rendered into English metre by Mr. F. Crawford Burkitt of Cambridge. It is a small quarto of 30 pages, printed in black, with paragraphs, indexes, and notes in red. It is bound in grey paper boards, with white labels. Only 300 copies have been printed. It is published by Mr. Edward Arnold at 7s. 6d.

But what is the Hymn of Bardaisan? It is a Gnostic writing attributed with probability, thinks Mr. Burkitt, to Bardaisan, the earliest historical name in the Syriac-speaking Church. It is an allegory. The prince who leaves his Father's throne to come down to earth is your soul or mine. The robe or heavenly body is left in heaven and grows with the earthly growth of the soul. And when the soul has accomplished the work on earth, and secured the Pearl, the soul and the body meet in glad embrace, and are one for ever in the Father's presence. It is a simple stirring allegory. Mr. Burkitt's metre carries the impression of the original, and does not seem to lose a drop.

Messrs. Hinds & Noble are enterprising publishers of New York city. Their latest enterprise is their greatest. It is a new Bible. It is a Bible in Hebrew and English, and there are three English versions. Besides the Authorized and Revised Versions (any one can publish the Revised Version in America now), which run down either side of the page, there is a verbal translation in the middle of the page, each Hebrew word having its proper English word or words immediately below it. The work is to appear in several volumes. The first volume covers Genesis and Exodus. Its purpose is to teach the Hebrew language. It desires to start beginners in the study of that

language, to encourage them to begin by showing that it is not difficult, and to gently lead them on to grammars and lexicons and higher things. The editor is Dr. G. R. Berry of Chicago University. One of the best things in the book is the select readings from the Septuagint, Syriac, and other versions given at the foot of the page. For these alone some would be glad to have the book at hand. The price of the volume is $4.

PRAYER AND PRAISE FOR EVENTIDE. By the Rev. W. Odom. (*Home Words Office.* Crown 8vo, pp. 98. 1s. net.)

Mr. Odom has compiled a book of simple evangelical prayers and hymns, and he has written for it a preface breathing an earnest desire for the revival of family worship.

A new edition has come out of Professor Waddy Moss's history of the Inter-Testament period of Hebrew life, which he calls *From Malachi to Matthew* (Kelly, 2s. 6d.). It is one of the 'Books for Bible Students' which have been so capably edited by Mr. A. E. Gregory. This is its third edition, and it shows that there are earnest students of biblical literature, and more of them than ever. Professor Waddy Moss has written many of the articles on this period for the new *Dictionary of the Bible.*

FROM COMTE TO BENJAMIN KIDD. By Robert Mackintosh, M.A., D.D. (*Macmillan.* 8vo, pp. xxii, 287. 8s. 6d. net.)

Even by those who have not been able to follow his career, Dr. Mackintosh will be remembered as the author of a fresh study of *Christ and the Jewish Law.* Since the issue of that work, Dr. Mackintosh has done both preaching and teaching, and he has gained the power of simple straightforward expression. His first book was so involved in style as to be nearly unreadable; this volume is easily read. It is also full of matter, of ripened, chastened thought.

Some doubt may be entertained of the wisdom of choosing such a title. But it is a fair enough title. For the volume is a survey of the literature that lies along the boundary line between ethics and biology, and that literature began with Comte, and was carried to its furthest possible point by Benjamin Kidd. It is not a formal essay in religion or ethics that Dr. Mackintosh offers us; it is a series of criticisms and reviews. But they are all connected by the unity of their subject, and taken together they give us a clear idea of the present position of biological ethics, and carry the scientific study of that most impressive subject a step forward. A more formal treatise might not have done this, and it would have been much less entertaining.

Professor Mackintosh is at home in his subject —especially the ethical side of it—and moves without disorder among its scientific and theological pitfalls. He is also candid enough, though a believer, to secure our confidence. One may doubt if much is to come out of the present alliance between science and faith, but whether anything comes out of it or not, the alliance is good.

THE MODERN READER'S BIBLE: BIBLE STORIES. By R. G. Moulton, M.A. Ph.D. (*Macmillan.* 12mo, pp. xii, 130. 2s. 6d.)

Professor Moulton has added to that very useful library he calls 'The Modern Reader's Bible' two volumes for children. The one is Stories from the Old Testament, and has been already noticed. The other is Stories from the New. There are two parts, the Life of Jesus being the first, the Acts of the Apostles the second. From the Life of Jesus Dr. Moulton chooses a series of incidents, some sayings, the parables, and the last scenes. From the Acts of the Apostles he selects such portions as cover the period, and reproduces its characteristics and accomplishments. It is all told in the language of the Revised Version.

THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF PAUL. By G. H. Gilbert, Ph.D., D.D. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. x, 279. 5s. net.)

Professor Gilbert of Chicago wrote recently a *Life of Jesus*, and it took its place almost at once at the right hand of the earnest working student. It was less easily read than other Lives. It was more thorough and more exact than most. *The Student's Life of Paul* is a companion volume. Within quite moderate compass, it gives all the actual events, and opens the way to their application in preaching and in life. It is a learned and independent book. On the Galatian question it does not follow the view that Professor Ramsay has made the popular view in our time. It is not as advanced in criticism as, say, McGiffert; it is not so conservative as, say, Farrar. The new

knowledge does not run away with Professor Gilbert, but it is known and well considered.

The sixth volume of the *Eversley Shakespeare* (Macmillan, 5s.) contains King John, Richard II., and both parts of Henry IV. It is truly the reader's Shakespeare. The type is so clear, the paper so good, the size so convenient—all is on the side of quiet, considerate enjoyment.

ETHICS AND REVELATION. By Henry S. Nash. (*Macmillan.* Crown 8vo, pp. 277. 6s.)

Having been appointed Bohlen lecturer, Professor Nash chose 'Ethics and Revelation' as the subject of his lectures. The lectures are now before us. They are characteristically American. But they are characteristic of the best American Christian speculation—and, as you know, that is finer than most English acquiescence. The speculation is always reverent. The heart of it is sound. And if it moves us a little forward in our conception of Revelation and even of Ethics, we are only the better for that. The great principle that Professor Nash lays down is that 'Duty is one and abiding, but duties come and go with historical situations.' And then, on the other side that Christianity is a book-religion, but 'a timeless book is a thing built into the very framework of the human mind.'

PANJABI SKETCHES. By Two Friends. (*Marshall Brothers.* Crown 8vo, pp. 110. 2s. 6d.)

Sir William Muir has contributed an introduction to this book which guarantees its reliability, and, at the same time, sends one into it with an appetite. The sketches are from the life and full of it. What a wonder it is that Indian mothers should be so indifferent to their daughters' welfare, and that English women, who are no drop's blood to them, should tremble with sympathy and interest. It is Christ that does it. One's only regret has been expressed by Sir William Muir; it is that when *we* are interested the story ends.

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have published cheap editions of three books by the late Rev. John McNeil of Australia and of one book by the Rev. Andrew Murray. Mr. McNeil's books are *Honey Stored and Gathered* (1s. net), *Some One is Coming* (1s. net), and *The Spirit-Filled Life* (3d.). Mr. Murray's is *Absolute Surrender* (1s. net). Mr. Murray is difficult to follow, except by his followers,—but they find him sweeter than honey. Mr. McNeil was a great evangelist in his day, his day is not yet set. His books are easily read, and stir the deepest depths.

The same publishers have issued a most distressing though loving sketch of the life of Digby Henry Dent, who gave his life to prison reform in Singapore. The title is *Two Commissions.* Also, a little volume of essays entitled *A Parable in Porcelain*, by Irene H. Barnes.

Mr. Andrew Melrose has published the official *Report of the Christian Endeavour Convention* held at Belfast in Whitsuntide 1899 (8vo, 1s.). It contains many portraits and addresses.

KING ROBERT THE BRUCE. By A. F. Murison. (*Oliphant.* Crown 8vo, pp. 159. 1s. 6d.)

A new definition is needed of the word 'popular' as applied to books. Some books have been published of late that are popular in the proper sense of that word, that is, appeal to the great reading public, not the educated specialist, but are as severely exact in their search for fact and in the statement of it as though they had none but the specialist in mind. Among these books the series entitled 'Famous Scots' takes a leading place.

Mr. Murison is patriotic enough to believe that the literal truth can be told even about the Battle of Bannockburn. He prefers indeed to understate the evidence of Scotland's glory rather than fall on the other side. But what he does say he says well.

WHEN THE ANGELS HAVE GONE AWAY. By the Rev. G. Critchley, B.A. (*Stock.* Crown 8vo, pp. 189.)

Some of these sermons seem commonplace. But some are distinct and striking. There is, for example, the sermon on 'The Heredity of Religion.' Its text is 'Thou shalt be saved, *and thy house.*'

Mr. Elliot Stock has published an essay on 'The Blessed Hope,' to which is given the title of *Hereafter.* The author is the Rev. W. Q. Warren, M.A., Vicar of Steeple Bumpstead in Essex. It is no discussion of the problem of the destination of the wicked. It is the lot of the blessed dead that is

considered, and there is much to cheer and give God-speed in the journey Zionward.

Quaero is the enigmatic title of a new book by James H. Keeling, M.D., published by Taylor & Frances. Its subject is the great present-day subject of the relation between biological-evolution and conduct. Dr. Keeling seems well acquainted with the biological side of the subject; and he uses his knowledge in support of some startling theories, which are not in the least likely to find acceptance, but do us the great service of letting us see how little we know. In the end Dr. Keeling is both orthodox and comforting.

The following pamphlets have recently been published:—*Where is Mount Sinai?* by Professor Edward Hull, LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S. (Victoria Institute); *Whispers from the Unseen*, by the Rev. E. W. Shepheard-Walwyn (Stock); *Sacerdotalism and Sunday Schools*, by John Clifford, M.A., D.D. (Sunday School Union); *Have I the Spirit?* by H. K. Wood (Drummond's Tract Depôt); *Sanctification*, by the late Principal Cairns, D.D. (Drummond's Tract Depôt); *Ritualism*, by J. W. Ewing, M.A., D.D. (Hopkins); *The Duty of Nonconformists*, by the Rev. H. H. Carlisle, M.A. (Allenson); *The Supper of the Lord*, by H. C. G. Moule, D.D. (R.T.S.); *Eating Christ's Flesh*, by the Rev. F. Paynter, M.A. (Marshall Brothers); *The Rent Veil*, by J. L. Wood (Marshall Brothers); *Sincerity in Religious Thought*, by the Rev. J. H. Crooker (Amer. Unitarian Assoc.); *The English Reformation*, by James Gairdner, LL.D. (Macmillan); *The Historic Significance of Episcopacy in Scotland*, by the Rev. H. M. B. Reid, B.D. (Blackwood); *Is the Christian Ministry a Sacerdotal Priesthood?* by the Rev. E. Keightly Botwood, B.A. (Stock); *The Communion and Communicant*, by the late Rev. Edward Hoare, M.A. (R.T.S.); *In Our Tongues*, by G. A. King, M.A. (B. and F. Bible Soc.); *Four Hundred Tongues*, by J. Gordon Watt, M.A. (B. and F. Bible Soc.); *The Shorter Catechism of* 1647 *and the Free Church Catechism of* 1898, by D. Douglas Bannerman, M.A., D.D. (Oliphant); *What Christians Need*, by George Clarke (Marshall Brothers); *On the Relations between Church and State*, by R. W. Church (Macmillan); *Approximate Chronology of the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ*, by W. H. H. Yarrington, M.A., LL.B. (Jarrold); *Calvary and the Tomb*, by Evan H. Hopkins (Marshall Brothers).

Spurgeon's Autobiography.[1]

When completed, this autobiography in four handsome volumes will form a goodly memorial of a godly man. For although Mr. Spurgeon was many-sided—preacher, pastor, theologian, educationist, philanthropist, and much else besides—he was pre-eminently a man of God. Early and sensibly led to a knowledge of the truth, he quickly ripened in grace, and manifested a faith at once simple and strong. His conversion took place when sixteen years of age. Referring to it long after, Mr. Spurgeon wrote: 'It is not everyone who can remember the very day and hour of his deliverance, but as Richard Knill said, "At such a time of the day, clang went every harp in heaven, for Richard Knill was born again," it was e'en so with me. The clock of mercy struck in heaven the hour and moment of my emancipation, for the time had come.' From that time of his 'espousals,' through many a chequered experience, on to the day when he rested from his labours, he was enabled in the exercise of a living faith to do many of the 'greater works,' serving Christ and approved of men.

Such a work as the present must be a source of great delight and inspiration to the large circle of those who had learned to love and appreciate the great preacher. Doubtless, it will prove no less potent to a rising generation who may have the happiness of perusing its stimulating pages. Indeed, for this end was it written. To prepare such a work was long a cherished plan of Mr. Spurgeon's. He had profited greatly by the experiences of other men, as set forth in their biographies, and he desired to discharge this debt by a record of the principal incidents in his own career. So busy a man could ill afford the time necessary to prepare a complete record, but fortunately the sketches prepared by him—mainly during his enforced holidays abroad—for what he termed 'my autobiography,' were easily linked to many personal experiences enshrined in his sermons and other published writings. In this way a story of remarkable virility has been presented to the Christian public. For Mr. Spurgeon was more

[1] *C. H. Spurgeon's Autobiography.* Vols. i., ii., and iii. Compiled from his Diary, Letters, and Records. By his Wife and his Private Secretary. London: Passmore & Alabaster. 10s. 6d. each.

than a sectarian, and his autobiography is a precious legacy to all the Churches.

While saying this we are not without a feeling that there has been undue expansion on the part of those charged with the work of preparation for the press. In the circumstances this may have been natural, but we are convinced that much would have been gained and little lost by restricting the work say to three volumes.

Dealing with the volumes as they stand, it may be noted that vol. i. covers the first twenty years of Mr. Spurgeon's life. It tells of his happy childhood in his grandfather's manse at Stambourne. Here it was that he may be said to have been born intellectually. Referring afterwards to the minister's study, he wrote, 'it was a dark den, but it contained books, and that made it a gold mine to me.' The manse garden was his happy hunting ground, and even the parish rectory became his palace of delights.

Mr. Spurgeon relates that on Sunday mornings he was usually put into the room beside his grandfather. That he might be quiet, the *Evangelical Magazine* was given him. He only perceived the full force of the arrangement in after years, but 'no doubt,' he says, 'my venerable relative knew more about the sedative effect of the magazine than I did.' How far this experience influenced Mr. Spurgeon, when he in turn wrote for and published magazines, is not recorded, but certainly few of his own writings could be administered for such a purpose.

His own father a minister of the gospel, and brought up under such influences, we are not surprised that he early manifested the preaching gift. At least two prophecies were uttered in regard to this element of his character, and it is remarkable to notice the minuteness with which they were fulfilled. When Spurgeon was ten years old, Rev. Richard Knill visited Stambourne as a deputy from the London Missionary Society. Mr. Knill was pre-eminently a soul-winner, and he was greatly drawn to the boy, with whom he contrived to have a great deal of loving Christian intercourse. Before leaving, Mr. Knill, in presence of the family, took the lad on his knee and said, 'This child will one day preach the gospel, and he will preach it to great multitudes.' Just ten years later he accepted a call to the pastorate of New Park Street Chapel. About this time Sheridan Knowles, the celebrated actor and play-writer, was converted and baptized. Having been appointed tutor in elocution at Stepney, now Regent's Park College, the students held a meeting, and presented the old man with a handsome Bible. In acknowledging the gift, Mr. Knowles exclaimed, 'Have you heard the Cambridgeshire lad?' None of them had. 'Then,' he continued, 'go and hear him at once. His name is Charles Spurgeon. He is only a boy, but he is the most wonderful preacher in the world. Mark my word, that young man will live to be the greatest preacher of this or any other age. His name will be known everywhere, and his sermons will be translated into many of the languages of the world.'

We are told a great deal about Mr. Spurgeon's early spiritual experiences. As might have been expected from his environment, his youth was bright and ingenuous. He rejoiced that through the Lord's restraining grace, and the holy influence of his early home-life, both at his father's and grandfather's, he was kept from certain forms of outstanding sin in which others indulged. Referring again to the beneficial influence of the minister's study at Stambourne, he says, 'out of that darkened room I fetched those old authors when I was yet a youth, and never was I happier than when in their company.' But when the great change of heart and life came, he traced it to none of these advantages, but simply to the 'preached word,' and that, too, addressed to him by a poor uneducated man, just as he afterwards acknowledged his first teacher in theology to have been the humble cook in his guardian's house at Maidstone.

It is interesting to notice the manifestations of the new life. His first Christian service was that of tract distribution. Writing to his mother, he says, 'I have thirty-three houses at present where I leave tracts'; and again, 'I have seventy people whom I regularly visit on Saturday. I do not give a tract and go away; but I sit down and endeavour to draw their attention to spiritual realities.' Following this, his interest was drawn out in connexion with the young. He became a Sabbath-school teacher. The superintendent observing his parts, soon found an excuse for asking him to take the desk. His addresses were so popular that quickly the older people came with the children. The next step was to the outlying villages, and very soon the district round about resounded with the praises of 'the boy preacher.'

Nor was his a zeal without knowledge. From the first he was a good scholar. At ten he took the first prize for English. He was reckoned an apt pupil, with a wonderfully receptive mind, especially in regard to Latin and Euclid. When fourteen he was certified as 'a thoroughly well-educated youth.' At this time he became an assistant teacher, and in return was helped with his higher studies by his principal, who declared that at sixteen years of age he was so advanced that he could easily have passed through the university had the pulpit not come in the way. How it came in the way; how as a mere lad,—he says himself, 'I know I wore a jacket,'—with no great scholarship, but with an unbounded passion for souls, he entered into and transformed the village of Waterbeach; how the carelessness of a servant-maid came between him and entrance into Regent's College; how an untoward incident at Cambridge led to his settlement in London; and how the mere 'handful of praying people' in the church at New Park Street began to develop under his ministry,—are all recorded for us in this volume in a most engaging manner. Here, also, we find the true inwardness of that oft repeated but apocryphal incident of Mr. Spurgeon illustrating his sermon by sliding down the pulpit stair—a story which emanated from the heated brain of a hostile critic. Nor were there wanting in these early days symptoms of that strong sanctified common sense which was such a prominent feature of his maturer years. Thus we find him saying that sermons to the young should not 'be so long and dull as to weary them'; and sermons to the grown people should not be 'muddled-up,' but according to a method, his own preference being for 'firstly, secondly, and thirdly.' Realizing the power of direct speech, he early set himself to master this accomplishment. Writing of these early efforts, he says: 'Ever since I have been in London, in order to get into the habit of speaking extemporaneously, I have never studied or prepared anything for the Monday evening prayer-meeting, I have all along selected that occasion as the opportunity for off-hand exhortation, but I do not on such occasions select difficult expository topics, but restrict myself to simple, homely talk about the elements of our faith. When standing up on such occasions, my mind makes a review and inquires, "What subject has already occupied my thought during the day? what have I met with in my reading during the past week? what is most laid upon my heart at this hour? what is suggested by the hymns and prayers?" It is of no use to rise before an assembly and hope to be inspired upon subjects of which one knows nothing; if anyone is so unwise, the result will be that as he knows nothing, he will probably say it, and the people will not be edified. But I do not see why a man cannot speak extemporaneously upon a subject which he fully understands. Any tradesman, well versed in his line of business, could explain it without needing to retire for meditation; and surely I ought to be equally familiar with the first principles of our holy faith; I ought not to feel at a loss when called upon to speak upon topics which constitute the daily bread of my soul.'

The second volume covers six years, and contains lengthy chapters of a tender and domestic nature. There are also interesting sketches of Mr. Spurgeon's first literary friends, such as James Grant of the *Morning Advertiser*, and Edwin Paxton Hood.

His experiences as a London pastor were simply a repetition of his work in the country village writ large. To say that he created a profound sensation is to put it mildly. Very soon after his settlement in the metropolis, besides preaching to huge multitudes in his own chapel, he was conducting services twelve or thirteen times a week, and travelling hundreds of miles by road and rail. The following is the striking testimony of Thomas Binney of the Weigh House Chapel. 'I have enjoyed some amount of popularity, I have always been able to draw together a congregation; but, in the person of Mr. Spurgeon, we see a young man, be he who he may, and come whence he will, who at twenty-four hours' notice can command a congregation of twenty thousand people. Now, I have never been able to do that, and I never knew of anyone else who could do it.'

After this it is amusing to read of his first journey to Scotland, which he visited on the invitation of his friend, Mr. John Anderson, merchant, Glasgow. In that populous city he preached to the usual crowds, but he fared otherwise in the north. 'There was one place where my friend Anderson was particularly anxious for me to preach; that was Aberfeldy, an obscure and curious village.' Here (Mr. Anderson's native place), 'nobody appeared even to have heard the name of Spurgeon,

so there was some difficulty in knowing how to draw the people together to hear the Word.' Even when assembled the douce villagers were rather a trial to the preacher, 'there were no eyes of fire and no beaming countenances to cheer me while proclaiming the gospel message. The greater part of the congregation sat in apparent indifference; they seemed made of lumps of ice. Certainly some did appear impressed; but, on the whole, I never saw so cold an assembly in my life.' The service over a rush was made for the door. Feeling rather sad, Mr. Spurgeon went into the street, and was delighted to find that although cold as marble in the building, the people were now hearty and full of feeling. Not only so, but they made an eager request that he would come again. The whole episode is reminiscent of Barrie, and might have stood as a prototype of *Auld Licht Idylls*.

Returning to London, Mr. Spurgeon's hands became more full than ever, and we are furnished with interesting details of the origin of the Pastors' College, and of his experiences in the region of authorship.

Then follows the sad story of the great catastrophe at the Surrey Gardens Music Hall, and the heroic efforts to build the 'Tabernacle,' as a permanent home for the congregation. It must have been with rare satisfaction that Mr. Spurgeon wrote in his biographical notes: 'During the time that the great Sanctuary was being completed, the remainder of the amount required was raised, so that the first Sabbath services in the new house of prayer were conducted in a building entirely free from debt.'

In the third volume, just published, the record covers a period of more than twenty years, and these comprise, perhaps, the most charming and fruitful days of this wonderful personality.

The account of the opening of the Tabernacle, on 18th March 1861, carries even the reader back to the day of Pentecost, and it seems the most natural thing for Mr. Spurgeon to say regarding a great Communion service held on 10th April of that year, that it was 'probably the largest since the day of Pentecost.' And yet this was but a presage of that which was in store. Apart from this record where else in the history of the pulpit have we such a statement as the following:—'For thirty years the preacher had regularly before him, Sabbath by Sabbath, between five and six thousand immortal souls listening to his proclamation of the Word of life.' Many of these must have re-echoed the testimony of Matthew Arnold, who, writing to Lord Houghton, said, 'I am glad I have heard him.'

In his day Mr. Spurgeon had to endure much virulent abuse, but he lived the gospel which he preached, and he conquered by the force of his great loving heart, no less than by his brilliant mental powers.

His affectionate nature drew forth the love of his people, and the elders and deacons familiarly spoke of him as 'the dear governor.' Though a great leader, he was not an autocrat, and the secret of his generalship rested in his making it a rule always to consult his office-bearers. Conventionality had no place in Mr. Spurgeon's vocabulary. He used often to say that his best deacon was a woman—alluding to Mrs. Bartlett, 'a choice gift of God to the church at the Tabernacle.' Little wonder, when we learn that she carried on the work amongst the young women for nearly twenty years, and that under her care the attendance at the senior class rose from three young women to between 600 and 700. The many-sidedness of Mr. Spurgeon is seen, not alone in his labours at the Pastors' College, his loving care of the Stockwell Orphanage, and his interest on behalf of the colporteurs; the broad human sympathies of the man, and the sweet reasonableness of his Christianity also appear in the eagerness with which he took advantage of such special occasions as the death of the Prince Consort, the Hartley colliery explosion, and the Lancashire Cotton Famine, to reach the heart and conscience of the nation, and to pour on wounded spirits the balm of the gospel he loved so well. One almost wonders that he bore the strain so long.

True, he died at the comparatively early age of fifty-six, but he *lived* every year of his life, and 'fifty-six is as good an age as the average of man may expect to live to,' was his own expression, many years before, when lecturing on the life of George Whitefield. From a physical point of view his secret seems to have been frequent short holidays. He could say, 'I have crossed most of the great Alpine passes'; and nothing delighted and refreshed him more in both brain and heart than a driving tour through the lanes and villages of charming Surrey.

As an author Mr. Spurgeon was most prolific, and his writings have gone to the ends of the

earth. We are furnished with a catalogue of his published works—it were no mean task to read them through. What Mr. Spurgeon himself read, the mental pabulum that enriched his own mind, we are left to surmise. Perhaps in the concluding portion of the work we may have light shed on this most interesting point. Towards the close of this volume his son Charles contributes a loving tribute and appreciation of his father. For our part, we feel disposed to sum it all up in the words which he himself applied to another, 'He was a good man, full of faith and of the Holy Ghost.'

J. H. MARTIN.

Dundee.

An Archaeological Commentary on Genesis.

By PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., OXFORD.

XLVI. 16. Arodi is 'Arvadite,' from the name of the Phœnician town Arvad.

17. Isui seems to be 'Usite,' from Usu or Palætyrus.

34. The herdsmen (*sekheti*) in the marshes of the Delta were regarded by the Egyptians of the old empire as social pariahs, and the artists represent them as dirty and unshorn. After the conquest of the country by the Hyksos or 'Shepherd' kings, this feeling was intensified. The herdsmen, at all events in the eastern Delta, were Shasu or Bedawin, and were looked upon as the Bedawin are to-day by the modern Egyptians. They were the gypsies of society, and came under the general heading of 'impure foreigners.'

XLVII. 4. In an inscription of Hor-m-heb (Armais), at the close of the eighteenth dynasty, now at Berlin, a group of Mentiu or 'Shepherds' from the Sinaitic Peninsula and the Haurân, are represented as bowing before the Pharaoh, and asking him to grant them land in which to pasture their flocks, 'as was the custom of the father of their fathers from the beginning,' since 'their lands hunger,' and they had nothing to live on. So, too, in the eighth year of Meneptah II. the Bedawin of Edom are allotted land in the district of Succoth—*i.e.* in Goshen—'in order to feed themselves and to feed their herds on the possessions of Pharaoh, who is there a beneficent sun for all peoples.'

6. These would be the royal 'superintendents of the cattle.'

11. The use of the name Ramses is proleptic, as there was no land of Ramses until after the buildings and restorations of Ramses II. in the districts of Zoan and Goshen. The first Pharaoh of the name was the founder of the nineteenth dynasty, and the grandfather of Ramses II. the Pharaoh of the Oppression. In a papyrus of that period mention is made of a Per-Ramses or 'temple of Ramses,' which Brugsch would identify with Zoan. See Ex. i. 11, xii. 37.

14, 15. The association of Canaan with Egypt is also proleptic, and carries us forward to the age of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, when Canaan was a province of Egypt. The subsequent verses show that only the Egyptians are referred to.

20–26. A great change came over Egypt during the Hyksos period. When the New Empire begins with the rise of the eighteenth dynasty, we find that the old feudal aristocracy have disappeared and have been replaced by royal officials, while their landed property has passed into the possession of the Crown and the priests. Instead of being held by private individuals, all land, with the exception of the fields attached to the temples, became the property of the Pharaoh, and was rented from him at a payment of twenty per cent. The Pharaoh thus became an autocrat, ruling over a nation of slaves, checked only by the power of the priesthood, and administering the country by means of a huge bureaucracy. It will be noticed that during the seven plenteous years it was the Pharaoh who had paid the twenty per cent. (xli. 34). In later times, after the age of the nineteenth dynasty, certain lands came to be assigned to the mercenary troops, who acquired great power, and founded or upset dynasties. When the story of Joseph was written, however, the possession of the land of Egypt was still divided between the Pharaoh and the priests (ver. 26). In Upper Egypt private pro-

perty survived the rise of the eighteenth dynasty for a short time, at all events during the reign of its founder. Baba, at El-Kab, in an inscription already quoted (xli. 54), states that he provided corn for the people during the famine, and 'Captain' Ahmes, who took an active part in the wars of liberation, not only tells us in the inscription in his tomb at El-Kab that he owned 'much land,' but also that he was presented by the Pharaoh Ahmes I. with '5 *arurœ* of land in' his 'city.' Consequently, 'all the land of Egypt' which Joseph 'bought for Pharaoh' could have been only that northern portion of it which was under the immediate authority of the Hyksos monarch. After the firm establishment, however, of the power of the eighteenth dynasty, and the foundation of their Asiatic empire, the agrarian system of the north must have been extended to the south, since long before the close of the dynasty all traces of private property in the country have disappeared. Perhaps civil and military appointments, or even allotments of land, in Syria were given in exchange for the old family estates in Egypt.

It will be convenient to sum up here the conclusions to which the archæological evidence points in the case of the story of Joseph. (1) It is based on an Egyptian original, and even possibly translated—or rather paraphrased—from some hieratic document like the account of the expulsion of the Hyksos in the Sallier papyrus. (2) In its present form it has been written in Palestine; it contains a strong Palestinian colouring, *e.g.* in making a famine caused by a failure of the Nile extend to Canaan, or in describing the financial operations of Joseph as affecting the south as well as the north of Egypt. (3) It is substantially historical, and even in details is correct as to the condition of Egypt in the age of the later Hyksos kings. (4) In its present form it is not earlier than the period of the nineteenth dynasty, and there is no reason for believing it to be later. (5) Certain words and phrases seem to indicate that they have been mistranslated from a document in some foreign language. That language was not Babylonian, and may have been Egyptian.

XLVIII. 22. The embalmed body of Joseph was carried to Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 32). The fact that Hamor is here called 'the Amorite' suggests the question whether Hamor, 'ass,' was not a contemptuous play upon the ethnic name Amor (but see Judg. ix. 28). It is difficult to reconcile the statement that Jacob had acquired the piece of ground at Shechem by means of his 'sword' and his 'bow,' with the fact that, according to Gen. xxxiii. 19, he had peaceably bought it. The patriarch Israel is here identified with the Israel of later days which conquered Palestine. The translation should be 'a Shechem more than thy brethren.'

XLIX. 5. The sense requires us to adopt the rendering: 'instruments of cruelty are their swords,' *mekhêrâh* being the Greek μάχαιρα, 'a sword.' Other Greek words occur in early Hebrew, like *lappîd*, 'a lamp,' Gk. λαμπάς, or *pilgesh*, Gk. παλλακίς, which have an etymology in Greek but not in Semitic, and indicate intercourse between the Greeks and Canaan. For this we now have archæological testimony, apart from the mention of Achæans (Aqaiush) and Danaans (Daanau), among the northern invaders who assailed Egypt in the reigns of Meneptah II. and Ramses III., since one of the Tel el-Amarna tablets states that an 'Ionian' (Yivana) was 'on a mission to Tyre.'

10. If Shiloh is not the name of a place ('until he come to Shiloh'), it may be the same as the Assyrian *sêlû*, 'a ruler.'

11. This seems to be a quotation from some older poem, since *oseri* ('binding') has no grammatical construction.

14. In the Song of Deborah (Judg. v. 16) the Hebrew words are translated 'among the sheepfolds' (instead of 'between two burdens'), which is probably more correct. The repetition of the expression in the two poems seems to show that it has been quoted from a common source. The ass or 'Khamôr' is a reference to Hamor of Shechem (see note on xlviii. 22).

15. Perhaps there is a reference here to the reign of Abimelech over Shechem (Judg. ix.).

20. The reference is probably to the 'kings' of Tyre and Sidon.

22. *Ben porâth*, 'son of fruitfulness,' refers to Ephraim, the 'fruitful.'

24. With *eben Israêl*, 'the stone of Israel,' compare the Assyrian *aban Samsi*, 'the stone of the sun-god.'

L. 2, 3. The art of medicine was highly appreciated in ancient Egypt, and there were special-

ists who devoted themselves to the study and cure of each single disease. But the physicians were not 'slaves,' nor did they embalm mummies. This was the business of the paraskeuites, Egyptian *khatfu*, Gk. παρασχενισταί, a special class of persons who were despised and shunned by their fellow-Egyptians. The leading paraskeuites, however, were what we should term surgeons, and they commenced the work of embalmment by extracting the brains of the corpse. In the time of Herodotos, the mummy, in the case of a 'first-class' burial, was kept in natron for seventy days after the removal of the intestines, but the process of embalmment had by that time doubtless become very elaborate, since we find a marked progress in this respect in the age of the New Empire as compared with the Old. Diodoros gives thirty days as the period over which the principal part of the operation extended, and seventy-two days as the period of mourning. We must note the statement that it was the 'Egyptians,' and not the Israelites, who mourned for Jacob seventy days.

4. Mr. Tomkins notices that Joseph spoke to Pharaoh's household, not to Pharaoh himself, because, in accordance with Syrian custom, he had allowed his hair and beard to grow in sign of mourning, and was therefore, by the rules of the Egyptian court, excluded from the Pharaoh's presence.

7. The 'elders' are the *uru*, or 'great ones,' of the Egyptian texts.

10, 11. These two verses interrupt the context, and seem to be an interpolation intended to explain the name Abel-Mizraim. The name, however, had nothing to do with the 'mourning of the Egyptians,' but signified 'the meadow of Egypt,' and was a reminiscence of Egyptian rule in Palestine in the time of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. *Abel* was a common term in Canaanitish geography, and is accordingly found several times in the (Palestine) geographical lists of Thothmes III. and his successors. Thus Thothmes III. mentions the Abel of Carmel and the Abel of Irtu (perhaps Jordan), and Ramses II. the Abel of Karzak. The eastern side of the Jordan would have been far out of the road from Egypt to Hebron, which ran either along the edge of the Mediterranean Sea ('the way of the Philistines,' Ex. xiii. 17) or past the modern Kantara to Beer-sheba (Gen. xlvi. 1). There must have been a local legend at Abel-Mizraim based on a 'popular etymology' of the name which connected it with the mourning for Jacob.

22. A hundred and ten years is the number of years which, when a long life is desired, is invariably asked of the gods in the Egyptian inscriptions. So in 'the oldest book in the world,' the Proverbs of Ptah-hotep, written in the time of the fifth dynasty, the author says at the end of his work: '(To be a good son) has caused me on earth to obtain one hundred and ten years of life.'

I have now reached the end of this archæological commentary on the Book of Genesis, and must briefly gather up the general results. In the first place, the archæological evidence is wholly against the so-called literary analysis. The author of the book has indeed made use of older documents, but these documents are Babylonian and Egyptian, possibly also Canaanite and Edomite, and we can establish their existence only by means of the archæological evidence. A comparison of the Biblical and Chaldæan accounts of the Deluge shows that the 'literary analysis' of the account in Genesis is merely a philological mirage. The same conclusion may be drawn from the archæological testimony to the 'two accounts' of the Creation, the history of Joseph, etc., while the use of different terms like 'Amorite' and 'Canaanite,' 'Padan-aram' and 'Aram-naharaim,' which has been assumed to characterise different Hebrew writers, turns out to do nothing of the kind. Secondly, narratives which the 'Higher Criticism' had pronounced to be legendary are proved to be historical, and the accurate agreement of other narratives with the circumstances and conditions of the periods to which they profess to belong favours the presumption that they are historical also. Thirdly, a good deal of the history must have come over with comparatively little change from the patriarchal age. A considerable amount of it must be dated at least as early as the epoch of the Egyptian nineteenth dynasty, that is to say, the Mosaic period, and there is no reason for believing that the main part of the Book of Genesis is of later date. Fourthly, in many cases it has been shown that the history rests upon written sources, not on oral tradition, and the presumption is that it will be also found to do so in cases for which at present no archæological evidence has been obtained. Fifthly, while there

are portions of the book which can be ascribed to the Mosaic age, there are passages and statements which belong to a much later date. In ch. x., for example, the mention of the Medes and Kimmerians cannot be earlier than the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. We must admit, therefore, that interpolations and re-editing were allowed down to the time of the Exile, if not later. Sixthly, there are narratives which interrupt the context, and do not harmonize with its statements. This is the case with the account of Jacob's theft of his father's blessing (ch. xxvii.), and the anticipatory blessing of Joseph and his two sons by Jacob (xlviii. 2–7), which breaks off in the middle of a sentence. Such narratives, it will be noticed, are written from the point of view of a Bedawi rather than from that of a member of a settled society. Consequently they do not admit of archæological treatment. Seventhly, whatever may be the source of the older narratives employed, they have all received a Palestinian colouring.

To sum up the general impression left upon me by the archæological evidence: Genesis is substantially a work of the Mosaic age, and has been compiled out of older written documents, the majority of which were in the Babylonian language and script. Its narratives are substantially historical, and in their earliest form were coeval with the events they record. But other and later elements have been mixed up with them, and in its present form the book contains passages, partly interpolations, partly modifications of the original text, which bring us down to the age of the Exile. Throughout it is intensely Hebraic, and written from a Palestinian point of view. Finally, the archæological facts seem to me diametrically opposed to the results and theories of the so-called critical analysis.

Some Exegetical Studies.

By the Rev. James Wells, D.D., Glasgow.

The Sacred Art of Contemplation.

This is my third paper on this great subject. In the first I examined the four most interesting of the New Testament words for 'beholding.' These are: *κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, to behold in a mirror (2 Co 3^{18}); *ἐποπτεύειν*, to be like the initiated when they behold their chief religious mysteries (2 P 1^{16}); *θεᾶσθαι* and *θεωρεῖν*, to behold as men do in the theatres or at the public games (John's Gospel, 1^{14} and 17^{24}). In the second paper I postilized upon two of the four elements in Christian contemplation—Clearness and Admiration. I am now to examine two other secrets of success in spiritual study. These are Steadiness and Assimilation.

Steadiness.—In the Greek churches they have the curious practice of suspending ostrich eggs from the ceiling. The idea is, we are told, that the mother bird hatches her eggs by steadfastly gazing upon them. Southey has embodied this myth in his 'Thalaba.' The suspended eggs are a symbol of the power of continuous contemplation.

He who had been initiated into the mysteries was supposed to be a delighted and lifelong beholder of them; the spectators at the games could not see them too often or too long; life for them had lost its best charm when these were over. Beholding is quite different from a hurried glance. It is no *πάρεργον*, no *nebensache*, no by-job. Continuity is one of the secrets of what has been called 'the lost art of meditation,' or what the mystics call recollection. 'Meditate on these things,' Paul says to Timothy. To meditate is *in medio esse*. The butterfly flits over a thousand flowers, while the bee lights on one, buries itself in the middle of it with a hum of satisfaction, and remains there till it has emptied the honey-bag at the bottom. Literally the bee is *totus in illo*. To be interested (*inter esse*) has the same meaning as to meditate. As with the three who beheld Christ's glory on the Holy Mount, meditation wishes to pitch its tent near the loved object, so that it may gaze without let or hindrance. For the full appreciation of the truth, as in many chemical processes, time and the right

temperature are needed. He who wishes, not the skim milk, but the cream of any subject, must give it time to gather. Only by firing often are colours in stained glass made permanent; only by long steeping is the wool dyed in its every fibre; only by repeated impressions are pictures chromo-lithographed upon the clean page. Herein lies the philosophy of stated worship and of devout study. These are needed more than ever in this age of hurry and hard driving, of numberless committees and absorbing enterprises. We need to know better what we know; we need to feel what we know; we need the growing vision; we need a soul-bath and a life-bath in the great certainties of our faith; we need to muse till the fire burns. The angels blessed Abraham because he entertained them, it has been said; and they can't bless us unless we entertain them too. 'By daily reading and meditation in the Bible he had made his soul a library of Christ,' so said Jerome of his friend Nepotian. Mr. Gladstone said that if he differed in anything from others, it was in his power of concentration. The difference between Christians may be safely explained in the same way. The cherubim are regarded as the symbols of contemplation; and they have their eyes fixed upon the mercy-seat. The beloved disciple was known in the early Church as ἐπιστήθιος, the close leaner upon the breast; and it is he who emphasizes most the beholding of the glory of Christ. He can never be a profitable seer, some one has said, who is either never, or always, alone. Christ's example justifies the saying; for He went about continually doing good, and He often had periods of seclusion. The secret of the Lord is with those who sometimes shut the door and enter into their closet. A preacher tells beautifully how he got fresh light on this subject from his little granddaughter. She had a great secret to tell him. She entered his room on tiptoe, carefully and softly shut the door, climbed on his knee, and told her secret in his ear.

Steady, continuous study is needed for success in every department. Even the eye needs prolonged contemplation and consequent enlargement before it can 'take in,' as we say, any grand object. The Americans tell you that you must stay a fortnight at Niagara before you can see it. They are quite right. You must conquer the narrow associations of a lifetime before you can apprehend so colossal a spectacle. I have read that when painters go to Rome, they at first imagine that they may imitate the great masterpieces of painting and sculpture. But after their artistic faculties have been educated by months of converse with these great models, they despair of ever equalling them. I recently came across a statement about one of these painters, and I here give the substance of it. The noblest objects never disclose their best meaning at first. Sir Joshua Reynolds in Italy was for some time disappointed with the famous pictures he studied. He could not perceive their supreme excellence. But he persevered in his study. At last the pictures began to raise their veils, and give him an occasional peep at their beauty. By and by, in return for his devotion, they flung away all reserve, and revealed to him all the wealth of their charms. To see beauty, even on the canvas, one needs a trained eye, and a just taste. The perception of moral and spiritual beauty must demand a still higher education.

Assimilation.—Clearness, Admiration, Steadiness, and Assimilation are the four great elements in our conception of Sacred Contemplation. Beholding in a mirror the glory of the Lord, we are being metamorphosed into the same image (2 Co 3^{18}). Earthly beauty, however skilfully pictured, however constantly gazed upon, cannot reproduce itself in the beholder; but life-giving influences stream from Christ and stamp His image upon the receptive disciple. The study of His life infuses a generous heavenly spirit into the soul. Froude—is it not he?—says that for years Carlyle was to him the standard of excellence in literature, and that in all he wrote he had a tacit reference to his judgment. In this way his opinions and style were formed. To the Christian, Christ is the one standard of excellence, and it, or rather He, has a transforming power. In other regions, genius is a creator, not an imitator; here imitation and creation are one.

The soul assimilates easily all the good qualities which it heartily admires. Love secures effortless receptivity; for it adjusts all our capacities to the truth, and opens the heart-sluices to all holy influences. Admiring love always brings with it that *empfänglichkeit* upon which the Germans insist so much. John, in his Gospel (chap. $1^{14.16}$) plainly presents to us the assimilating power of devout meditation. 'And we beheld His glory.

. . . And out of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.' It was this beholding that made them the Christians they became.

David Gilmour tells us, in his *Pen Folk*, that one day the little company were discussing man's chief end. 'What is God's chief end in man?' one of them asked. The answer was, 'To make angels of the men and women He creates.'

Contemplation and action have been declared to be the perfection of man. This contemplation must secure answerable action, for the glory presented to us in the mirror of the Gospels is of One who went about doing good. There is a contemplation which is most successful on the intellectual side, and yet paralyses action. Amiel is one of the best known examples of this barren meditation. He tells us, in his *Journal Intime*, that all his life he suffered from what he happily calls 'The Malady of the Ideal.' He seems to have been aware that it was a complication of indolence and intellectual pride. He was so afraid of doing anything imperfectly, that he ended by doing nothing at all. To avoid this and that failure he made his life a failure. The love of the better stood between him and the good. He had 'the purism of perfection, which poisoned for him all imperfect possessions.' The real disgusted him; it was poor by comparison with his ideal. 'Action coarsens thought,' he says, and therefore he shunned action. He would not make the venture to which his convictions often called him. He keenly felt that he had entirely failed in life. *Omnis moriar* was his pathetic lament.

Action is the perfection of Christian thought. Study is the parent of ideas, and ideas should be the parent of deeds; knowledge is not a luxury, but a weapon and a talent. Even Christian culture may become almost as selfish as the merely academic or the pagan. The worthiest conception of life rises from culture to discipline, and from discipline to the service which is deliberately preferred and gladly chosen.

When a preacher handles a very high spiritual theme, he begins to be afraid of losing the sympathies of his hearers, and casts about for some method of justifying his doctrine at the bar of common sense. I might cite Plato's intense faith in the wonder-working, man-making power of noble and well-beloved ideas. But I shall take a much homelier illustration. Now and again English judges declare from the bench that the 'penny dreadfuls' and low novels seduce boys, even boys of good family, into highway robbery and burglary. In the mirror of these vile periodicals, the impulsive youth beholds what seems to him the glory of his lawless hero, and mistakes his evil for good. He admires Robin Hood or others of that ilk, resolves to imitate them, and is soon changed into the same image from shame to shame, even as by the spirit of the devil. Can it then seem irrational or incredible that the admiring student of the noblest of all truths should be profoundly influenced by his studies? For all the ordinary laws by which character is formed are on his side; and besides, this Christian assimilation is a work of grace and a work of God. The Spirit is the agent of this transformation. It is brought about even as by the Spirit of the Lord; that is, by all those subtle and mighty influences which are peculiarly His own. This is the blessedness of the beholder of the glory of the Lord; this is the great reward of his practice of devout contemplation.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Duhm's 'Die Psalmen.'[1]

It is no disparagement of the earlier volumes in this most excellent series to say that we have now before us by far the most interesting of the set. I have read somewhere that in mediæval times a child's patron saint was determined by lot. Happy the child to whom a powerful and sympathetic saint was thus assigned! Happy the man, *cæteris paribus*, who is singled out from amongst his collaborators on the Old Testament Scriptures to expound the Book of Psalms! It is a great opportunity.

And Duhm has used it well. He is a little disposed to lament the scantiness of the space allotted him. But he has filled that space with matter of much moment. His Introduction covers fewer than thirty pages, and into that limited room he has compressed an immense quantity of information, thought, and suggestion. Yet withal, one reads it with no feeling of its being a mere outline, no sense of a straining after conciseness. And when we pass from the Introduction to the Exposition, each Psalm is found to be adequately treated. In both respects it compares most favourably with the latest German book on this subject with which English readers have now become familiar, Wellhausen's *Psalms*, and if it, in turn, were translated into English it would secure many deeply interested readers.

Without entering into a detailed examination or criticism, it will be enough to specify here the points which immediately catch attention.

No doubt the most salient feature is the thoroughgoing relegation of all the Psalms to a comparatively recent date. 'The Passing of David' is completely accomplished, and much more. In 1891 Canon Cheyne wrote: 'The only question is whether, considering how fond the psalmists are of quotations, they may not have preserved phrases or even whole verses of Davidic hymns, and whether the editors of the Psalms may not in the same conservative spirit have combined old Davidic with new and very un-Davidic material.'[2] Duhm[3] holds that there is not a Psalm which would compel an unprejudiced reader to think of itself as pre-exilic. Ps 137, which he judges to be the most ancient in the collection, he naturally assigns to the Babylonian Exile. Referring to the famous passage, Am 5^{23}, he deems it more than doubtful that we have any poems belonging to that period.

Moreover, there is no evidence which would prove to him that any portion of the Psalter was written in the Persian period. Much of it, on the other hand, belongs to the time of the Grecian domination. The numerous Maccabæan Psalms bear their date distinctly written on them, it being beyond question, *e.g.*, that Ps 74 was composed about 167 B.C. The Asmonæan high priests and the kings of that family who succeeded them, with their adherents, are responsible for not a few Psalms, Simon's name being given in acrostic form in 110[1]. And as certain N.T. critics found traces of a Pauline and a Petrine faction in the Acts of the Apostles, so in the Psalter there are works from the hands of the Pharisee opponents of the Asmonæan kings. The latest Psalms were produced about 80 B.C., and the collection was probably closed about 70 B.C., immediately prior to the appearance of the so-called Psalms of Solomon.

Obviously we have here a large opening for discussion. The general editor of these commentaries, *e.g.*, differs widely from his colleague, both as to the commencement and as to the close of this class of writings. 'Our present Psalter,' Kautzsch says, 'in all probability contains a fair number of pre-exilic songs or fragments of songs . . . The third collection (90–150) contained almost exclusively the later and latest Psalms down to the time of Simon, the founder of the Asmonæan dynasty (142 ff., B.C.).'[4] Critics who heartily assent to the principle that no Psalms can be shown to be Davidic will take exception to Duhm's wholesale transference of them to the latest period, as well as to many of his details.

For instance, the extraordinary boldness with which he affixes a date to so large a number of these poems will not pass unchallenged. It will not be admitted that Ps 18 can be more confidently dated than most of the historical and

[1] *Die Psalmen erklärt.* Von *D.* Bern. Duhm. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. Mohr, 1899. London: Williams & Norgate.
[2] *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 193. [3] P. xix.
[4] *Outline of Hist. of O.T. Literature*, pp. 143, 145.

prophetical writings of the O.T.[1] We are familiar with too many previous attempts at fixing the occurrences referred to in such Psalms as 18 and 68, to allow of our assenting to the categorical statement that 18, 21, 63, 68, 89, 132 were composed by writers friendly to the Asmonæan kings, and that 9, 10, 14, 56, 57A, 58, 59, 64, 82, 92, 94, 140, 'were probably directed against Alexander Jannæus and his adherents.'[2] The conjecture that the writer of Ps 51 was conscious of a sinful leaning towards the Greek ideal of life is not sufficiently borne out by the considerations alleged, viz. that 'to do that which is evil in Jahweh's eyes' usually signifies, in the Book of Kings, to depart from the Deuteronomic law, that the poet prays in v.[12] for a firm spirit, and, according to v.[13], fears that the Holy Spirit may be taken from him.[3] The power of the Deuteronomic law was felt long ere Alexander the Great was born. Men needed a firm spirit, as opposed to a yielding one, and had occasion to dread the loss of God's Holy Spirit in earlier days than those of the Greek influence. The textual emendation suggested for Ps 17[4] is still less acceptable: 'Seeing that no sense can be extracted from פָּרַיִן, I venture to see in Ps 17[4] the oldest passage in which the name of the Pharisees, פְּרוּשׁ or פָּרִישׁ (after the analogy of נָשִׂיא, בָּחִיר, and the like), appears. . . . Hence: *My steps held fast the way of the separated.*'[4] Wellhausen's emendation is preferable—נשמרתי מארחות, instead of אני שמרתי ארחות, 'Aloof have I kept from the paths of the violent.' And although Wellhausen asserts that the M.T. 'can only be understood as: I walk steadfastly in the paths of the violent,'[5] it is permissible to believe that the M.T. may be adhered to, and rendered: *I have observed*, etc., *i.e.* I have watched, considered, taken note of. שמר is used in senses sufficiently near to this. *À propos* of the class of Psalms which he attributes to the Pharisees, Duhm asserts that 'he who reads Ps 94 and Ps Sol 17 one after the other will be obliged to admit their inner connexion, and, consequently, their proximity in point of time.'[6] But is their inward resemblance close enough to justify the inference? Is not Ps Sol 17 for the most part a cento of passages, such as might have been put together by almost any cultivated Jew who sympathized with his people's troubles? Ps 94, on the other hand, though strongly reminiscent of the earlier literature, is the product of a decidedly more vigorous mind. The few lines of Natural Theology, vv.[9, 10], are especially worthy of notice. But the fact is that our verdict on the date of any single Psalm depends so largely on considerations which do not present themselves alike to all minds as to make dogmatism absolutely unsafe in the vast majority of cases. In many cases the utmost that can be said is that Duhm is interesting even when he fails to convince.

His treatment of the לדויד, which stands in the titles of seventy-three (LXX, eighty-three) Psalms, is fresh and instructive. 'The exiles by the waters of Babylon had "Songs of Zion" (Ps 137); after the age of the Chronicler, when Korah, Asaph, etc., had been transplanted into the age of David, "Songs of David" were spoken of. These became Songs of Korah, Songs of Asaph, when it was necessary to designate the guild which was accustomed to sing the poem in the temple choir. Song of Jahweh, Song of Zion, Song of David, etc., are therefore in contrast with the purely secular poem, the poem of the popular singers (מְשֹׁלֵים), of the יִזְרְעֵי נְהִי, etc., possibly, too, in some degree of contrast with such religious poetry as was not originally meant to be sung in the temple, but was intended, or at any rate employed, for other purposes, *e.g.* for singing by the pilgrims as they journeyed to the the temple. This explains how one and the same Psalm can have the title "Psalm of David, after Jeduthun" (Ps 39, 62), or placidly endures the names David and Jeremiah (Ps 137, LXX), David, Haggai, and Zechariah (Ps 138, LXX), David and the sons of Jonadab, etc. (Ps 71, LXX). The name David indicates its religious and ritual characteristics; Jeduthun, the mode of its musical execution in the liturgy; Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, the supposed authors; the sons of Jonadab, the original singers of the Psalm, and the circle in which it originated.'[7]

Duhm has ventured to prefix to each Psalm a definite statement as to its metre. No doubt he is right in treating this as a highly important matter. If the metre of the lines in a strophe can be determined all textual criticism of the lines

[1] P. xxi. [2] P. xxi. [3] P. 145.
[4] P. 48. [5] *Heb. Text of the Book of Psalms*, p. 78.
[6] P. xxii. [7] P. xv.

included in that strophe must take account of the law which has been ascertained. But it is necessary to be very careful. Duhm himself, who seems to be an adherent of what Dr. Driver[1] calls Professor Briggs' system of measurement by *accents* or rhythmical beats, does not expect that all his conclusions in this sphere will be accepted. One is inclined to think that Dr. Driver's remark on the serious objection to Bickell's theory, arising from the numerous alterations in the text of the metrical licences it requires, applies in some measure to the modified form adopted by Professor Briggs. But his articles in *Hebraica* and Duhm's procedure here are both worthy of study.

Most of us fall an easy prey to the seductions of an apt phrase. Duhm renders a real service by warning us against the seductions of that useful title which has been given to the Psalter, 'The Hymn-Book of the Congregation.' It is a useful title. It has relieved many minds from the ethical difficulty of believing that certain Psalms were the expression of an individual's feelings towards his enemies. But there was no congregation, in our modern sense of the word, at the temple service. When laymen took part in sacrificial worship they were not provided with voluminous hymn-books. Many of the Psalms were probably never sung at the temple. Many were not intended to be sung at all. 'It is therefore more correct to say that those who arranged and published the collection proposed to themselves to make a book which should promote the religious life of the people, a book supplying indeed the means of meeting certain requirements of the temple ritual (the Vow Songs), but especially destined to serve as a book of devotion and of reading, keeping the people in the discipline of the prescribed religion, stirring them up to study and follow the law. And this was the view of the author of the prologue, Ps 1.'[2]

Duhm's *Die Psalmen* will awaken the response for which he asks in the closing words of his Preface: 'In this work also I have had chiefly at heart the History of Religion. I reckon on readers who perceive that true objectivity consists, not in the adherence to what is ancient or to the opinions which prevail at present, not in "circumspect" rejection of new hypotheses, but in incessant striving after that truth which is usually obscure and frequently heterogeneous.'

JOHN TAYLOR.

Winchcombe.

[1] *Literature of the O.T.*, p. 362.

[2] P. xxiv.

Among the Periodicals.

The Hittite Inscriptions.

IN view of the controversy on this subject carried on by Professors Jensen and Hommel in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, it will be of interest to our readers to have some account of the attitude assumed by one whose competency to pronounce a judgment will be conceded by both parties—namely, PROFESSOR ZIMMERN. In the *Z.D.M.G.* (liii. pp. 168 ff.) the latter reviews Jensen's *Hittiter und Armenier*, and also makes reference to some of his more recent contributions to the solution of the Hittite problem, although he has been unable to take account (owing to the date of the publication of the *Z.D.M.G.*) of the articles in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, with the exception of that contributed by Jensen to the April number, to which there are some references in footnotes.

Zimmern considers that up till the time of the publication of Jensen's book no serious attempt had been made to meet the positions contended for by Jensen in his original article in the *Z.D.M.G.* of 1894. 'The objections founded upon by a Sayce or a Halévy were so superficial that Jensen was quite right to pass them over in the way he did in his Preface.' Since then Messerschmidt's criticism has appeared, but of this, too, Zimmern entertains anything but a high idea. Nor does he content himself with a vague condemnation, but, as readers of the *Z.D.M.G.* may discover for themselves, instances arguments and conclusions of Messerschmidt which show that he has worked his way very slightly into the inscriptions. Zimmern, who is perfectly discriminating and impartial in his criticism, makes an important confession at the outset. For a long time, he tells us, he was rather sceptical about Jensen's Hittite investigations. A mere surface reading of the original article, and even of the work *Hittiter und Armenier*, left upon his mind at most the impression 'it is possible' but not 'it is certain.' Even the specimens of translation put forward by Jensen

did not, by the mere reading of them, carry conviction to his mind. *But from the moment when he turned to the inscriptions themselves and examined Jensen's views alongside of these, he recognized, with growing certainty, that in Jensen's deciphering work one has to do with incontestable facts discovered by him, and not with mere possibilities, of a more or less certain character.*

Zimmern proceeds to ask and to answer three questions:—

1. Has Jensen really discovered the *meaning* of the inscriptions? From the circumstances of the case, it is of course quite conceivable that one might get at the contents of a Hittite inscription without being able to say what was the *pronunciation* of a single one of the signs employed. This last is a distinct question altogether, to which we will return presently. Well, Zimmern brings forward instances where he considers Jensen to have reached results as to the interpretation of certain signs, which may be said to be now out of the region of controversy. Zimmern's exposition is rendered perfectly clear by the reproduction of the Hittite symbols, a practice which unfortunately we cannot follow here. The first instance he takes is that of a group of signs which Jensen reads as the name and title of a king (in the nominative), followed by a group which is taken to be the name and title of the king's father (in the genitive), which, again, is followed by a symbol which is interpreted as 'son.' The result reached in this instance Zimmern cannot think will be long in gaining universal adoption. Not less worthy of acceptance he considers the conclusions of Jensen regarding the meaning of the hand and fist hieroglyphs, conclusions reached in the first instance from the texts themselves, but afterwards strikingly confirmed by the legends accompanying the figures of gods at Boghazköi. But, admitting the hand (and foot) symbols to be god hieroglyphs, the sense of a very large proportion of the inscriptions is practically determined. What they express will be the relation of the author of the inscriptions to the gods named in these, and the group of signs at the beginning or the end will stand for the name and title of the particular king, the country over which he reigned, his genealogy, and the like. No doubt it is a matter of regret that we get so little historical information from the inscriptions, but it is quite illegitimate to speak of its being 'inconceivable' that in most instances their contents may be reduced to something like this: 'I am So-and-so, king of such and such a land, son of such and such a king, servant of such and such a god, minister of such and such a goddess, worshipper of such and such another god.'

2. How far has Jensen succeeded in *reading* correctly the signs? Here again, in many instances, Zimmern thinks, final results have been reached. Pre-eminent amongst these are the readings of certain groups as = *Syennesis*, *Karchemish*, *Hamāt*, *Tarsus*, yielding the phonetic values for *s*, ', *n*, *k*, *mi*, *i* (*k*), *m*, *t*, *tr*. These and similar results are confirmed by the fact that readings arrived at sometimes quite independently of one another, serve to check one another admirably, and never come into collison.

3. Is Jensen right in holding that the *language* of the 'Hittite' inscriptions is cognate to the *modern Armenian*, or rather is actually the mother of the latter? Without being an Armenian scholar, Zimmern feels himself competent to judge of the degree of certainty which attaches to those words and endings which Jensen first obtains directly from the inscriptions, and then compares with the Armenian. When these are found to tally very closely with those of a language spoken to-day in a region partially identical with that where the inscriptions were composed between 1000 and 600 B.C., when indications are not wanting that the authors of our inscriptions were of Indo-Germanic descent, and when a specially competent Armenian scholar like Brockelmann (*G.G.A.*, 1899, No. 1) has declared himself so completely in favour of Jensen's identification of Hittite with Indo-Germanic Armenian, Zimmern cannot hesitate to give his suffrage in favour of the same conclusion. J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GENESIS.

GENESIS XXXII. 24, 25.

'And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was strained, as he wrestled with him' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'And Jacob was left alone.'—Jacob *remained* or *was alone behind*, on the right or north bank. It was the natural duty of the head of the party and owner of the flocks in such a case to be last on the ground, and see that nothing was left behind.—DILLMANN.

'There wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day.'—The word *wrestle* occurs only here and in v.[26]. The choice of the rare word is determined by the wish to play on the name Jabbok, as if it meant *river of wrestling*.—DILLMANN.

VIGOROUS as the wrestler's grasp is, Jacob is in no mood to be easily thrown; and maintains the struggle, how long it is impossible to say, but at any rate *until the breaking of the day*; 'wile baffled wile, and strength encountered strength, thus long, but unprevailing.' Jacob was not the aggressor, it was the man who wrestled *with him*. In fact it was, not as Jacob might first think, an emissary of Esau, but the real Champion of the land who must first be met before Jacob found entrance into Canaan. He had made his arrangements as if Esau alone had to be propitiated: he finds there are more formidable persons than Esau concerned in the matter; God always appears as the Champion for the wronged party.—DODS.

'When he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh.'—Jacob is confident he is sufficient for all comers and wrestles on, till at last the wrestler *touched the hollow of his thigh*. By a mere touch Jacob finds himself crippled. This suddenly discloses to him the real nature of his antagonist. And now his whole attitude changes; from a self-confidence which had got many heavy falls during his past life, but was still vigorous and hearty, he passed to dependence on another. No longer wrestling, no longer Jacob the supplanter, the clever tripper-up in wrestling who depended on his own skill and toughness; he hangs now on his antagonist and cries, *I will not let thee go, except thou bless me*. From wrestling he passes to praying, and so his self-confidence and his name Jacob pass away together. He is now *Israel, a prince of God*, 'for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed.'—DODS.

'The hollow of the thigh.'—The socket of the hip-joint, the hollow place like the palm of a hand (Heb. *Caph*) into which the neckbone of the thigh is inserted. The reason of this act of the angel was very probably lest Jacob should be puffed up by 'the abundance of the revelations'; he might think that by his own strength and not by grace he had prevailed with God; as St. Paul had the thorn in the flesh sent to him lest he 'should be exalted above measure.'—BROWNE.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

God's Contest with the Soul.

By the Rev. William Bright, D.D.

Jacob's character is hard for us to appreciate justly. We are repelled by the timorousness and craftiness of his Oriental nature. When he has to face a danger, he is frightened and gets round it by some elaborate artifice; yet his devices go on side by side with habitual piety. But if he is really religious why 'help Providence' by the schemes of a trickster? It vexes us to see a character so inconsistent with itself, but are we in a position to marvel at him? He is not given us as a pattern of a saint. He receives repeated tokens of Divine favour, but he suffers the penalty of his early sins, suffers danger, anxiety, bereavement. Yet through all he has a sense of the Unseen, and his character is gradually 'purified and elevated by the fixed religious principle, the resolute sacrifice of present to future' which Esau lacked.

In the contest at Peniel Jacob's sense of utter dependence on God has recently stirred the depths of his nature. He represents a soul constrained to feel its dependence on God as the Fountain of personal being and its Refuge. It is thrown upon itself, removed from the sympathies which halve the burdens of life, and then Divine grace finds its opportunity. Then God comes to the soul and forces the controversy upon it, and will not be denied. But human nature recoils and resists, and this unresponsiveness is not inconsistent with previous earnestness, with acts of faith and thanksgiving. The struggle may go on 'till the day breaks.' The lesson is harder than we thought; we are afraid of what we may be committed to; but then comes the touch on the hollow of the thigh,—some distress, illness, bereavement, anything which proves to us our own impotence.

Then the question is whether we will take the 'touch' in the right spirit. Pain does not always soften and subdue. It sometimes embitters, and the sufferer resists and may end in that fixed obduracy which extorts from God the sentence 'Let him alone.' And hell consists in being thus 'let alone' by God. Happy the soul which, like Jacob, accepts the touch as a warning given in mercy, seeks for closer union with Him who chastens in love, and begs for a fuller blessing. It comes, and the soul feels that its previous knowledge of God had been but 'the hearing of the ear,' that now it 'sees' Him. The vision passes, but so does the darkness. The sun rises upon the wayfarer for whom the night's experience has changed the face of life and of the world.

Are we resisting the appeals of grace? Do we need the touch on the hollow of the thigh? Let us beg God to show why He is contending with us. And if He has inflicted the shock, if we halt as we go forward on life's journey, let us adore the Hand which withers the strength of nature in order to bless us with the succours of grace. Let us believe that striving prevails with God, and that prayer takes the kingdom of heaven by force.

II.

Face to Face.

By the Rev. T. F. Lockyer, B.A.

1. Jacob's life might be called the History of a Sin. Perhaps it is this very fact which invests it with its enduring charm. While we admire Abraham's life, we are liable to be discouraged when we contemplate its moral greatness. But Jacob, full of infirmities yet desirous of better things, is nearer to us. With equal truth his life might be called the History of a Retribution, for retribution followed him throughout his career, and now when perhaps he had thought all danger and suffering past, his old sin rises up once more to condemn him. He is held fast by his sin, and his only hope is that he may find God. His desire is heard. He would touch God, and now God's very touch is felt; but it seems rather the assault of a Foe than the greeting of a Friend. And if God is Jacob's Foe, Jacob is, at first, God's foe. We do not easily let go our sin. We fight against God till He brings us to repentance by His touch. Now Jacob discerns that this enmity may be real friendship. God wrestles with his sin, but it is on Jacob's behalf; God's foe is Jacob's foe too. So he opposes God no more, but strives to lay hold of His saving strength.

2. The conditions which produced this crisis were twofold; evil circumstance and evil self—danger from his brother, and sin within. There were subsidiary conditions also—the darkness, the strange land, the solitude. It is only in solitude that the soul meets God face to face.

3. The consequences of this crisis in Jacob's history were a strong life and a strong death. His following life was strong and pure in comparison with the years before. He gained power over circumstance and power over sin, for when we have seen God face to face, and made His strength our own, He gives us peace from the tyranny of both. And he died as a conqueror, without fear, with princely dignity, for if we have known God face to face in life, we shall not fear to come face to face with Him in death, but to us, as to Jacob, death will be His messenger to take us home.

Illustrations.

When conscience wrestles with me, it is always in the form of a man. It is my higher self that strives with me—the Christ within. We have all a higher self—a photograph which God took in some pure moment. We have left it behind, but it follows us. It meets us in our silent hours. It confronts us with the spectacle of what we might have been. It refuses to let us go until it has blessed us. It is the same thing which Paul felt when he spoke of the spirit lusting against the flesh. The spirit was his better photograph, his Christ, his hope of glory. It is to all of us our hope of glory. It is not the actual man that makes us feel immortal: it is the ideal man—the man that might have been. That is the reason that to me conscience is precious even when it wounds. It is no foreign hand that strikes me; it is my higher self, my inner man, my likeness as God sees it. It is the image of me that is hung up in heaven—the picture on which my Father gazes to avert despair. It is not only with *me* that the man wrestles; he wrestles with the Father *for* me. He pleads my future possibilities. He suggests my coming glory. He tells what I would be in less vile raiment. He shows what I *may* be with the ring and the robe. He reveals how I shall look at the breaking of the day.—G. Matheson.

Many a man, at the close of his trial, has found out that he has been trying to throw down his own blessing.—T. de Witt Talmage.

THE blessing came when the wrestling was over, and when the clinging came; and that is what God means, but He means all that—to come down upon us, and to stand over us, and to set Himself against us, and to seem to be the worst enemy we have—an enemy who springs upon us in the darkness, and makes our faces to grow white with fear. If He put out all His strength, He could hurl us shrieking into the outer darkness. But it is not meant for that. It is meant at last to bring us to understand Him, and to cling to Him, and to give up all duplicity, and all deceit, and all dissimulation, and all double-mindedness, both before God and men, all playing fast and loose with our own conscience, and with what we know to be right—to bring all that to an end, and with the arms of our faith round about Him, just to cling, and cling, and cling. Then we win.—J. M'NEILL.

IMPORTUNITY is of the essence of successful prayer. Our Lord's references to the subject especially imply this. The Friend who is at rest with his family will rise at last to give a loaf to the hungry applicant. The Unjust Judge yields in the end to the resistless eagerness of the widow's cry. Our Lord's blessing on the Syrophœnician woman is the consecration of importunity with God. And importunity means, not dreaminess, but sustained word. It is through prayer especially that 'the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.'—H. P. LIDDON.

PEOPLE read this passage as though the leading thought in it were *the power of prayer*—as though Jacob wrestled with God all night, and so at last obtained the blessing. Surely this is wrong. It was *God* who wrestled with Jacob all night, to break down proud self in His child; and this in order that He might, as a matter of free grace altogether, bless His child.—A. C. PRICE.

COME, O Thou Traveller unknown,
Whom still I hold, but cannot see,
My company before is gone,
And I am left alone with Thee;
With Thee all night I mean to stay,
And wrestle till the break of day.

I need not tell Thee who I am,
My misery or sin declare;
Thyself hast called me by my name;
Look on Thy hands, and read it there!
But who, I ask Thee, who art Thou?
Tell me Thy name, and tell me now.

In vain Thou strugglest to get free,
I never will unloose my hold;
Art Thou the Man that died for me?
The secret of Thy love unfold.
Wrestling, I will not let Thee go
Till I Thy name, Thy nature know.
. . . . .
Yield to me now, for I am weak,
But confident in self-despair;
Speak to my heart, in blessings speak,
Be conquered by my instant prayer!
Speak, or Thou never hence shalt move,
And tell me if Thy name is Love.
. . . . .
Contented now upon my thigh
I halt, till life's short journey end;
All helplessness, all weakness, I
On Thee alone for strength depend;
Nor have I power from Thee to move;
The nature and Thy name is Love.

C. WESLEY.

Sermons for Reference.

Aitken (W. H. M. H.), Mission Sermons, iii. 38.
Beecher (H. W.), Sermons, ii. 106.
Bright (W.), Morality in Doctrine, 199.
Brown (H. S.), Manliness, 129.
Burns (J.), Select Remains, 87.
Calthrop (G.), Eden to Patmos, 20.
Candlish (R. S.), Discourses in Genesis, ii. 74.
Clifford (J.), Daily Strength for Daily Living, 39.
Davies (D.), Talks with Men, Women, and Children, iv. 466.
Dix (M.), Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical, 180.
Ewing (A.), Revelation as Light, 1.
Farrar (F. W.), Fall of Man, 236.
Harrison (W.), Clovelly Sermons, 101.
Hutchings (W. H.), Sermon Sketches, ii. 95.
Jukes (A.), Types of Genesis, 351.
Litting (G.), Thirty Children's Sermons, 154.
Lockyer (T. F.), Inspirations of the Christian Life, 177.
M'Neill (J.), Regent Square Pulpit, i. 193.
Magee (W. C.), Sermons, i. 170 (Contemporary Pulpit Lib.).
Matheson (G.), Searchings in the Silence, 108, 110.
Moorhouse (J.), Jacob, 35.
Mozley (J. B.), Parochial and Occasional Sermons, 347.
Parker (J.), City Temple, 1870, 373.
Plumptre (E. H.), Theology and Life, 296.
Price (A. C.), Fifty Sermons, i. 73.
Robertson (F. W.), Sermons, i. 236.
Stanley (A. P.), Addresses and Sermons in America. 71, 200, 228.
Taylor (W. M.), Limitations of Life, 30.
Thorne (H.), Foreshadowings of the Gospel, 32.
Trench (R. C.), Sermons Preached in Ireland, 1.
Vaughan (C. J.), Family Prayer and Sermon Book, ii. 531.
Vaughan (J.), Fifty Sermons, 1874, 235.
Walker (E.), Sermons on Old Testament Subjects, 44.
Wilberforce (S.), Heroes of Hebrew History, 48.

Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.[1]

By Professor Ed. König, Ph.D., D.D., Rostock.

II.

A special series is made up of passages in which Professsor Margoliouth thinks to account for a 'nonsense' in H[2] by recourse to the *Persian* language.

(*l*) The series begins with 42^{14}. The expletives which Margoliouth (p. 13) showers upon the text of H 42^{14a} I find superfluous. For, seeing that it is an established fact (see above, 2 *ad init.*) that the text of H has come down to us in a corrupt form, it may be that in this instance too the words offered in the marginal note exhibit the original text. This suggests that also in $v.^{14b}$ we should turn from the text to the marginal note, the language of which may mean, 'And the house of a woman that likes to scorn pours forth scorn.' The feminine form תביע may be due to the influence of the feminine genitive מחרפת, as in חצי היריעה תסרה of Ex 26^{12}, etc. (see my *Syntax*, § 349a), and 'the house of a woman' might all the more readily be simplified by G into 'woman' (γυνή), because בית, 'house,' is a frequent term for 'woman' in later Hebrew (Levy, *NHWB* i. 224b). Then $v.^{14ab}$ forms a climax *ad peius*, and the final חרפה of the original, to which also ὀνειδισμόν points, may have been displaced by אשה, because the latter stood at the end of $v.^{13b}$ and $v.^{14a}$, and thus a *homoioteleuton* took place. Schlatter (p. 39) prefers the *text* of $v.^{14b}$. He regards the terminal word אשה as original, and renders, 'and in the house of a scorner (fem.) the woman chatters.' But mere 'chattering' would be no such abhorrent quality; and in this way neither could G have been derived from H, nor H from G. Finally, Margoliouth (p. 13) seeks to restore the text of $v.^{14b}$ from the *Persian* language. He invites us to translate the four words of this text literally into Persian, and then we shall see what was meant by ובית מחרפת תביע אשה. I have sought to follow his directions, but have failed to discover a sound sense for $v.^{14b}$. Margoliouth says expressly that the Persian word for 'woman' is to have the indefinite article and the accusative sign. Well, the Persian word for 'woman' is زن, the indefinite article is ی (*i*), and the accusative sign is را (*ra*). The Persian rendering of $v.^{14b}$, as proposed by Margoliouth, would thus have ended with the accusative *zan-i-ra*, and this would have been reproduced by the Hebrew retranslator as אשה. But neither do I see how this *zanira* of the Persian translation could originate from γυνὴ αἰσχύνουσα εἰς ὀνειδισμόν, nor how it could give a good sense to the אשה of H.

(*m*) Regarding 43^{2a}, I cling, in the first place, to the idea that the ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ of G is connected with בצרתו. Or may not צורה, 'form' (صورة, 'image'), be contained in בצרתו? 'Picture' and 'appearance' are cognate notions. Or did בצרתו originate from בצרחו, and the latter from בזרחו, 'at his rising or appearing' (2 Ch 26^{19b})? Neither supposition is easy; but is there then no connexion between ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ and בצרתו? Let us, however, assume that צרתו is, with the marginal note, to be changed into צאתו. Then the rendering would be, 'The sun, when it goes forth, causes the beams of light to stream out.' For, as מביע is connected with the יביע of Ps 19^{3a}, so is the חמה borrowed from Ps 19^{7b}, where it is used for the beams of light. The latter conclusion is commended also by the circumstance that the commencement of 43^{3a} still deals with the illuminating function of the sun, and that it is only from the closing words of $v.^{3a}$ onwards that the author comes to speak of his warmth.—Margoliouth, for his part, is full of praise (p. 9) for G in 43^{2a}, namely, ἥλιος ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ διαγγέλλων ἐν ἐξόδῳ. But, if חמה and הצהיר did

[1] The whole of Professor König's examination of Professor Margoliouth's pamphlet is in the Editor's hands, but it is too long for one insertion, and there is the less need for inserting it all at once that its method and general result are now apparent, and Professor Margoliouth has stated that he intends to make no reply.

[2] H stands for the Hebrew text of Cowley and Neubauer, G and S stand for the Greek and Syriac versions respectively.

not speak of the light-giving quality of the sun, this latter function would not be touched on at all. Moreover, if the sun was referred to as 'proclaiming by his appearance,' the following, 'by his forthcoming,' would be tautological; and if *ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ* was intended to mean 'by his shining,' the sun would do this all the time he shines, and not merely at his rising.

The main point, however, is the following. Margoliouth (p. 9) attaches his explanation of 43^{3a} to *διαγγέλλων*, 'proclaiming,' which, in my opinion, is borrowed somewhat mechanically from Ps 19^{3a}, the מביע חמה of H having been forced into the background by a reminiscence of יַבִּיעַ אֹמֶר of Ps 19^{3a}. Let us see whether the explanation of Margoliouth is to be preferred. He presupposes that חמה means 'warmth, heat,' and discovers the common source of 'proclaiming' (G) and 'discharging heat' (H) in Persian-Arabic. For 'between the Persian word for "speech" (ساخن) and the Arabic word for "heat" (ساخن), which a Persian may use if he likes, there is nothing but the context to distinguish.' Notwithstanding, the case does not appear to me to be quite so simple. For it is assumed that the 'retranslator's' Persian friend who, according to Margoliouth, translated G for him, chose precisely the phrase, *sukhun afshāndan* as the equivalent of *διαγγέλλων*, and that the retranslator himself supposed that he had before him not a Persian but an Arabic word. Besides, the Persian translator of G would thus have dropped either *ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ* or *ἐν ἐξόδῳ*. Perhaps, then, my suggestion as to the connexion between מביע חמה and *διαγγέλλων* deserves the preference.

(*n*) 43^{6} reads in H, 'and also moon by moon the times (*or* seasons) return: a dominion over the end (*i.e.* forming the boundaries of time), and a sign for the hidden time (*i.e.* the latest future).' In the eyes of Margoliouth (p. 11), this is 'a piece of nonsense.' I wait with composure to see whether many will agree with him in this judgment. Meanwhile let us examine his view of G and S. G offers, 'and the moon in all things to her season, showing of times and a sign of eternity,' while S is to be rendered, 'and the moon ariseth to her time, a showing of times and a sign from everlasting.' According to Margoliouth 'the Syriac and the Greek help us to excellent sense,' and he derives H from G thus: 'The corrupt Greek "in all" has been literally rendered باهر, and that word sometimes means "the moon."' (He means by this that the Persian با = 'with,' 'to,' and هر = 'every one, all,' and that the Arabic باهر, *bâhirun*, signifies 'mirabilis, splendens luna.') He adds that the Greek 'unto her time' was probably rendered by the words بر بار (the Persian بر = 'at,' and بار = 'time' [Germ. *Mal*]). The Hebrew plural עתות is not taken into account by Margoliouth. On the other hand, he thinks to derive the שבות, '(are) returning,' in such a way that the final letter of بار (namely, *r*) was supplied with a point and read as *z*: *bāz* [Persian باز] = 'again,' 'back.' I confess that this derivation of H in 43^{6} appears to me neither necessary nor probable.

(*o*) 43^{13a} is wanting in S and reads in G, 'By His command He hurried down the snow,' whereas H has, 'His might marks out the lightning.' Margoliouth (p. 10) thinks that he can derive this last with certainty from a *Persian* source, because 'snow' = Persian برف, *barf*, and 'lightning' = Persian برق, *barḳ*. But here again one may be permitted to offer certain objections. Let us assume that H had a Persian exemplar before him, yet we must ask if in this exemplar not only were the forms of ف and ق precisely alike, but also the important points in ف and ق respectively neglected? Hence I venture, in spite of Margoliouth's confident opinion to the contrary, to suggest that the coincidence of 'snow' (G) and 'lightning' (H) with the Persian *barf* and *barḳ* is a fortuitous one. Further, I regard the ברק of H as more original than the 'snow' of G. The latter version might consider it necessary to avoid 'lightning' in v.^{13a} because it employed *ἀστραπή* in v.^{13b}. The 'snow,' moreover, appears to me as almost too usual a phenomenon to be presented as the subject of a special Divine command. Besides, snow is spoken of in v.^{17c}. And why, finally, should the supposed Persian translator of G have replaced 'by His command' by 'and His might'?

(*p*) In 43^{17c} H has 'like lightning (s?) he scattereth snow.' Was perhaps רשפין (cf. רשפים, 'lightnings,' in Ps 78^{48}) intended, and is not the ו of שלגו a dittography of the following ו? G has *ὡς πετεινὰ καθιπτάμενα*, 'like birds flying.' Margo-

liouth (p. 11 f.) holds that the Persian translator of G used the word *parwāz*, and that this signifies (1) 'flight, flying,' and (2) 'light, splendour.' In point of fact, the first sense of پرواز is 'alarum solutio, *i.e.* volatus' (Vullers, *Lex. Pers. s.v.*), but if the plural πετεινά had been given to the Persian to translate, would it have been natural to select پرواز as the rendering of this? Moreover, the participle καθιπτάμενα would thus have been passed over by him. For me it is not yet made out that this was the course of events. I see in the 'birds' of G an obvious simplification.

(*q*) 43^{22b}, finally, reads in H, 'Dew releasing serves to make shine with fat the parched ground' (*i.e.* שרב, Is 35^{7}). G has 'Dew appearing will bring refreshment from (*or* after) the scorching wind.' H is not 'ludicrous,' as Margoliouth (p. 12) supposes. Nor is there any ground for assuming that H took the verbal form ἱλαρώσει for the dative of the substantive ἱλάρωσις. Do not the infinitive with ל (*liqṭol*) and the future often answer to one another in Hebrew? Cf. my *Syntax*, § 234, 399 *z*. May not then לרשן and ἱλαρώσει have *both* a future sense? G, moreover, took שרב in its most obvious sense, namely, 'heat' (Is 49^{10}, where the LXX reproduces שרב by the same word καύσων, which is used by G in Ecclus 43^{22b}), but שרב possessed also a second sense, namely, 'the parched ground' (Is 35^{7}), and this was intended here. This meaning of שרב was not, however, present to the mind of every reader, and hence the marginal note exhibits the easier expression, רטב, *raṭob*, which in Job 8^{16} signifies 'the green.' There is thus no need to trace back the לרשן of H to the Persian چربی, which signifies 'fat,' and to take this word 'in its secondary sense of "mildness," "softness."'

In this way I have come to the conclusion that the *text* of H is neither in such a bad condition that it exhibits a corrupt form of G and S, nor is based upon a—corrupted—exemplar of a Persian translation of G. By the way, Margoliouth's theory that H is 'a translation of a corruption of a Persian translation' (p. 10) is in contradiction with his assumption (p. 20) that a Persian friend of the re-translator translated G for him into Persian.

Contributions and Comments.

The God Mani.

In the August number of The Expository Times (p. 526) Mr. Johns cites from *W.A.I.* iii. 66, col. 3, line 2, 'Manu the great' as the name of a god worshipped in the temple of Ninib at Asshur. Lenormant had already offered the interpretation, '*Manou le grand, qui préside au sort*' (evidently in allusion to the Arab. *manîyat*, 'fate,' 'death-lot,' and the well-known goddess Manât). The text of *W.A.I.* iii. 66 is made up of a long list of gods which I have transcribed in full in *P.S.B.A.* xxi. pp. 117–131, and partly explained (*Assyriological Notes*, § 40). There, amongst the gods worshipped in the temple of the god Ib (not Nin-ib) at the city of Asshur, a 'great Ma-nu' (not Ma-a-nu nor Ma-a-ni) is named. Now, since there is a well-known ideogram *ma-nu*, which, with the determinative prefix, 'wood, tree,' is read in Semitic *eru*, and since, on the other hand, among the gods who have the predicate, 'great,' the most prominent is the god of pestilence and death, *Girra-gal* (the Sumerian *gal* = 'great'), or, in a later transformation, *Irkalla*, I should be disposed to view the expression, 'the great *ma-nu* (or *eru*),' as one of the favourite Rebus puns of the Babylonians, and to see in it nothing else than Irkalla, or Nirgal. The meaning of the Sumerian *manu* is probably 'ark' (*eru* and *erinnu*, cf. ארון) along with the divining staves kept in it, whence *manu* is actually rendered also 'staff.' In this case the supposition would not be excluded that this Sumerian *manu* is an ancient Semitic loan-word, with the original sense of 'lot,' 'fate.'

On the other hand, the Egyptian personal name cited by Mr. Johns, which has come down to us in Assyrian tradition, *Pûti-ma-a-ni* (*Pûṭi-mâni*), is either Πετεμῖνις (as *Pûṭisheri* = Πετοσῖρις, *Pûṭi-Hûru* = Πετε-ῦρις or *Poṭi-Hor*), or perhaps better, an abbreviation of *Pûṭi-Amâni*, *Poṭi-Ammon*, just as the name פטמן of Aramaic tradition is perhaps rightly explained as from פטאמן. It thus scarcely contributes anything to the explanation of the *Meni* of Is 65^{11}.

On the other hand, I regard it as absolutely certain that the well-known Nabatæan and S. Arabian goddess of destiny, *Manawât* (*plur. majest.*), or *Manât*, had originally her complement in a male deity *Meni*, especially as besides the Arabic *Manât* we find also *manîyat* (plur. *manâyâ*), 'death-lot,' which in form is nothing else than the feminine of a word *manî*.[1] Also in *S. Arabia*, in very ancient times, a goddess of destiny, *Manawât*, appears to have been worshipped. In Gl. 284, l. 5 (Minæan collection in British Museum), immediately after the priests of 'the god,' κατ' ἐξοχήν (אלהן, *ilâhân* = N. Arab. *allâhu*), there are

[1] So Ges. *Wörterb.*[13], *s.v.* מְנִי.

named the overseers (קדם, *ḳuddam*) of *Manawât*, and in Gl. 343, 2 (*ibidem*) it is said:—

[והפטּ] נפש ומנות ואהל אמנהתן

i.e. 'and the dead-watchers [a class of priests; cf. נפש, "tomb"], and Manawât, and the people of *Amnât*.' This last designation, which occurs several times besides,[1] appears likewise to apply to a class of priests, and in all probability to those who stood in a special relation to the goddess Manawât. For, as there is no verb *manaha*, the ה in אמנהתן will be here, as elsewhere in Minæan, only *graphic*, and thus *amnâtân* will be the *status emphaticus* of an inner plural *amnât*, which then, of course, can come only from the same root, *manawa*, from which *Manawât* itself comes.

Munich. FRITZ HOMMEL.

P.S.—In my article on the Hittite Inscriptions in the July issue (p. 460[b]) '*m*u-ḫatimmu (written *amêlu*, 'man,' and *MU*) = "baker,"' is of course a printer's error for '*n*u-ḫatimmu,' etc. (*nu* being ideogram for *amêlu*, as in the word *nu-gish-sar*, 'gardener'), just as in the August number (p. 528[a]), in Jensen's unfortunate reply, '*J*arkhu' is a misprint for '*T*arkhu.' I have then to ask the reader kindly to make the above correction of '*m*u-' into '*n*u-'. To everything else which Jensen has brought forward in the August number I shall reply elsewhere, as too heavy a demand has already been made in this matter upon the readers of this magazine. My end, which was to show that other attempts at decipherment besides Jensen's have their possibilities, has been abundantly served, and that this is the general impression I gather from Professor Ramsay's note last month (p. 527[b]).

Professor Ramsay and the Hittite Inscriptions.

Now that the controversy between Professor Hommel and myself is at last closed, as far as the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES are concerned, I have no wish to enter upon a new discussion with Professor Ramsay, but I may be allowed to offer a few *final* remarks on his note in last month's issue (p. 527). Two undeniable facts are established: (1) that Sayce in 1893 (*Recueil de travaux*) gave so full a transcription *and* translation of several Hittite inscriptions as deserved no other name than a 'decipherment,' and his article was entitled accordingly, 'The Decipherment of the Hittite Inscriptions'; (2) that in 1898 (EXPOSITORY TIMES, December, p. 115[b]) he spoke of the inscriptions as 'undeciphered,' from which I could draw *no* other conclusion than that he had abandoned his former results. I could judge only from Sayce's *published* utterances, and not from his *private* communications, incompatible therewith, with Professor Ramsay, to whom, it appears, he confessed long ago that his attempts at decipherment had been fruitless. Although Professor Ramsay is right then from *his* point of view, I may confidently leave the reader to judge whether, in view of the above facts, I can fairly be charged with 'extraordinary misrepresentations' of Sayce's position, and the like.

For the rest, I for one do not think that Professor Ramsay by his statement has improved Professor Sayce's position. P. JENSEN.

Marburg.

[1] *E.g.* Hal. 237, 2, and Gl. 282, 1.

The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus.

I.

I HAVE read Professor König's first article, and have no intention of answering him, however many he may write. It is sufficient to notice one of his comments to show the grounds of this resolution.

43[4c].—לשאון מאור תנמר נושבת. He ascribes the translation, 'blowing out a tongue of light that blazes' to *me*; it is the translation of Ben-Sira's grandson, *i.e.* the ancient Greek version, ἀτμίδας πυρώδεις ἐκφυσῶν! One thing that is absolutely certain is that no Hebrew Ben-Sira that differs widely from the Greek translation has any chance of being genuine. Here, however, the difference between the two is obviously slight. The Hebrew 'tongue of flame' is represented by 'sparks'; the Hebrew 'blowing' by 'blowing out'; and, thirdly, the Hebrew תנמר by 'fiery.' Therefore, either Ben-Sira (if the Cairene text is genuine) used תנמר in the sense of 'fiery,' or his grandson thought he meant 'fiery' by it; of this, supposing the Cairene text to be genuine, there is no question. But to make it mean 'fiery' we must suppose it to be the Arabic *tajammar* or *tujammir*, which is only found in *vulgar* and *provincial* glossaries, and which is therefore a late word. Now, neither Ben-Sira nor his grandson can have been acquainted with a late Arabic word; therefore the Cairene text is spurious. What does Professor König mean by saying an appeal to the Arabic is out of place? Have the readings of the Greek translation, which was in all probability made from an autograph copy of the original, no authority?

However, Professor König says this rendering of the Hebrew is wrong, because נשב is only used intransitively in the Hebrew Bible. As the word occurs only once, this seems a trivial objection; however, we learn from it that, in Professor König's

opinion, *Ben-Sirá can in no way have deviated from biblical usage.* For if he may not have used with an accusative a word which, only occurring once in the Bible, is used without one, he clearly can have taken no liberties with biblical words.

Therefore the right translation is 'a tongue of light consumeth the inhabited country.' But what has become of our canon about biblical words? נמר is used *five times* in the Hebrew Bible, and never once in his way! Apparently then the rule about biblical words only applies when the genuineness of the Cairene document is attacked; but when it is being defended it does not apply.

But granting that this is the right translation, Ben-Sira is made to say that the sun is or has a tongue of light that annihilates the inhabited country! I have called that statement blasphemous folly, and can think of no other description that would suit such nonsense. If the sun's light annihilated the inhabited country, instead of rendering it habitable, there would be no Ben-Sira and no Professor König.

Professor Schlatter, the only editor who seems to think it even desirable that Ben-Sira should talk sense, justly objects to the 'tongue of light.' The Greek translator would not have rendered this by 'sparks,' therefore it must be a rendering of the Greek. Now in Persian a form of the word for 'tongue' is regularly used for 'flame'; 'tongue' is *zabān*, but 'flame' *zabānah*. This accounts for the introduction of the 'tongue'; hence I should be prepared to argue the spuriousness of the Hebrew out of this line alone.

In order, therefore, to win on this one point Professor König (1) makes *me* the author of the ancient Greek version; (2) makes Ben-Sira rave; (3) starts an absurd canon, and grossly violates it the moment it goes against him.

Since Dr. Schechter rightly states that his 'Ben-Sira' exhibits the developed Rabbinic dialect,—I might add not only exhibits it, but shows its author very imperfectly acquainted with it,—I have in any case won on the original controversy; for it was the assertion that Ben-Sira wrote a post-biblical language which brought down a storm ten years ago.

I do not think the Cambridge fragments will be defended by any one; hence the Oxford portion will fall with them. But in any case it is evidently useless for me to argue any more with Professor König.[1]

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Oxford.

II.

Professor Margoliouth, in a notice headed 'The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus,' on p. 528 of the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, makes the following remark: 'It would seem difficult to outdo the mistakes of the Baghdad Jew; but Dr. Schechter has succeeded. He explains the fact that the differences between Greek and Hebrew are explicable from Persian by supposing that the Greek may have been made from a Persian translation of the Hebrew. The Greek translation was made before 100 B.C., and we have MSS of it earlier than 500 A.D.; and the Persian language did not come into existence before 650 A.D.!'

1. On this wanton attack I beg to remark that the words which Professor Margoliouth perverts (not quotes) are to be found in Dr. Taylor's part of the work, p. lxx, *not in mine.* In fact, I did not think Professor Margoliouth's *pas-quil* sufficiently important to make it a subject of discussion at all in what I considered a serious piece of work.

2. His attack on Saadyah is not to the point. Saadyah may have been mistaken as to the question of points and accents,—just as so many thousands of divines were mistaken about this question when they thought that the Bible was originally provided with vowels and points,—but this does not alter the fact that Saadyah did know our text. The famous occasion, then, improvised by the Laudian Professor, when the Baghdad Jew cheated and the Christian pelted him with texts from the Apocrypha, must have taken place some generations earlier than the Laudian Professor assigns to it. I may perhaps add here that it was I who first drew Professor Margoliouth's attention to the existence of the *Sepher Haggalui* when I met him at the Oriental Congress in Paris, and even borrowed the book for his use from Professor Derembourg.

3. The proofs of Professor Margoliouth in paragraphs 1 and 2 only show what has been pointed out so many times that our copyist made use of various MSS, inserting all their doublets and mistakes. Est 1^{10} (Mehuman) will explain the *Neeman.* Comp. Paulus Cassel's Commentary on this verse.

4. I have 'tasted the delights of authorship' long before the Laudian Professor began his famous career of literary failures, both in Aryan and Semitic languages. In my youth I even enjoyed a controversy, when conducted on gentlemanly lines; but I must decline any further correspondence against Professor Margoliouth, whose methods do not recommend themselves to me as either gentlemanly or scholarly.

S. SCHECHTER.

Cambridge.

[1] *Gumre* was used for 'coals' by the real Ben-Sira 8^{10}. The denominative would mean 'to fumigate.' See B. *Shabbath* 18 *a, b.*

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.

47,375

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room

DEMCO

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY